LANDMARKS OF
Svami Dayanand's Teachings

GANGA PRASAD UPADHYAYA, M. A.

...A SAMAJ. ...

ओ३म्

LANDMARKS OF

SVAMI DAYANAND'S TEACHINGS

VEDIC LIBRARY
Cl. No.........
Ac. No.........
ARYA SAMAJ ...

By

Ganga Prasad Upadhyaya M.A.

Secretary

International Aryan League

Delhi

Published by

KALA PRESS,

Allahabad.

21.1...

First Edition] 1947 [Price Rup...

FOREWORD

When Svami Dayananda opened his eyes (1863 A. D. or about) he found India precipitating to its utter ruin. Her empire had gone, her independence had been totally lost, her religion and culture were in decadence, her social solidarity had been shaken, her language had been suppressed and her wealth despoiled. The sons and daughters of India were dragging on their miserable existence as slaves to foreign arms and foreign thought. It cut him to the quick. He took a vow of lifelong celebacy and devoted his cent percent thought to diagnose the disease and find out remedies. He roused India to the consciousness of her past glory, present helplessness and future possibilities. He brought hope where there was despair. He brought strength where there was weakness. He brought light where there was darkness. He brought order where there was chaos. He founded the Arya samaj in 1875 and in that very year was finished his magnum opus the "*Satyārtha Prakāsha*" or "The Light of Truth." The modern India with all the changes of out-look owes a great deal to the marvellous penetration and bold

advocacy of this great sage. The programme he has chalked out is so comprehensive, so all-round, so deep and yet so broad, that no lover of the country or mankind can afford to ignore it. The present booklet gives a few extracts from the *Satyārtha Prakāsha* so that those who have no leisure to make an extensive study of Svami Dayananda's work might get a few glimpses of this great sage's thoughts.

DAYA NIWAS
Allahabad
1. 1. 47.

Ganga Prasad Upadhyaya

CONTENTS

1—RELIGION

Unprejudiced study

Things common to all religions are all obvious truths

Dispute about non-essentials

Differences create miseries

Four determinants of right conduct

2—INDIA OR THE ARYAVARTTA

Place of 1st creation

Only one man-clas in the beginning

Coming of Aryans to Aryavartta

Aryas sole overlords of the whole world

Cultural set back

Regeneration by Sivaji and Guru Govindsingh

Mahabharat—big shock

Class-hatred

Class-distinction man-made and not God-made

Patriotic feeling of Europeans

Learned people compared to a Boat 10

3—EDUCATION

Something about conception 1

Education the best ornament 1

Separate institution for boys and girls. 1

Parents to be penalized for not educating their children 1

What the students should avoid 12
Brahmacharya or complete celebacy 13
Flesh, wine, early marriage etc. to be avoided 14
No restrictions over the study of Vedas 15
Women and Shudras authorised 15
Women folk received efficient education in the Vedic age 16
State Patronage for education 18

4—SUPERSTITIONS CONDEMNED 19
Ghosts and evil spirits 19
Magic formulas 19
No confidence in imposters 19
Characteristics of Imposters 20

5—MARRIAGE AND MARRIED LIFE 21
Marriage after education 21
Demerits of near marriages 21
Age for marrige 22
Consent of the bride and the bridegroom 23
Happy family 23
High honour to ladies 24
Husband and wife not to live separately 24
House holder's duties 25

6—RIGIDITY OF CASTE CONDEMNED 26
Merits, temperaments, not birth, the criterian of a caste 26
Mutual goodwill among all the *varnas* 26
Brahma Samaj and Prathana Samaj 26
Caste and foreign travels 28
Dining and Inter-dining 30

7—GOVERNMENT 31

No absolute power of government 31
King under the people 31
No victory for unjust and condemnable 31
Ministers and their qualifications 31
King and Govt. Officers to act according to the wishes of the people 32
Method of Govt. 32

8—GOD 33

The conception of God 33
The stupendous creation of God 33
God is one and one only 34
God's attributes 34
Devatas 34
Residence of God 35
God merciful as well as just 36
God is formless 37
God all-powerful 37
No incarnation of God 38
Sins are not forgiven 40
True Vedanta 40
Soul and God 40
Forms of worship 41
So called incarnations of God 42

9—TRANSMIGRATION OF SOUL 46

Many births 46
Knowledge of Soul limited 46
Emancipation of soul 47
Coming back from emancipation 49

10—THE THREE ETERNALS 52

God, Soul and materia radica 52
Three Causes of the world 52
Beginning of the Universe 53
When was the world created ? 54

11—THE VEDAS 55

Two kinds of Scriptures 55
Vedic Religion 55
Revelation of the Vedas 55

12—HOMA (FUMIGATION) 57

Benefits from Homa 57
Homa and Veda Mantras 58
Asvamedha, Gomedha, Narmedha 59

13—FLESH AND WINE 61

Students to abstain 61
Evil Effects of flesh and wine 61
Killing of useful animals such as cow 62

14—SANYASA 65

Four ashramas 65
Duties of Sanyasins 66

15—BURIAL OF THE DEAD 68

Burial of the dead harmful 68
Method of cremation 69

16—BELIEFS OF SVAMI DAYANANDA 70

Definitions & Explanations of some of the Religious technical terms 70

—:o:—

RELIGION

It is incumbent upon all men to look upon things with an eye of justice. The sole purpose of being born as man is to learn what is truth aud what is untruth, and not to uphold wrangling. Learned men of unprejudiced mind alone can calculate the harm, done in the past, being done in the present, and likely to be done in the future by religious hostilities. As long as mankind is not freed from the habit of falsely denouncing each other's religion, the world cannot be happy. It is not impossible, for all and especially for learned persons to be able to accept the truth and reject the untruth, if they give up their pre-suppositions and ascertain the truth with open mind. It is certain that the differences of the learned people are the cause of the differences among the common people. If learned men rise above their selfish motives and work for the welfare of all, they can be united todav and be of one religion.

(**XI 3 p. 386*)

---

* 'The Light of Truth' or English Translation of Svami Dayananda's Satyartha Prakash by Ganga Prasad Upadhyaya. Ed. 1946.

My view-point is this. All those things which are common to all religions are obviously true and must be accepted. And on this basis should be condemned false things which create differences in different faiths.

(Intr. 9 p. 4)

In fact what is basic truth is common to all religions. The dispute is about non-essentials. Or when one side is true and the other untrue, then also there is an occasion for quarrel. If the debating parties have the ascertainment of truth, as their only object of discussion, they can surely come to a speedy conclusion.

(Sub-Pref. III p. 684)

At present there are many learned men in all religions. If they give up prejudice, accept all those broad principles on which all religions are unanimous, reject differences, and behave affectionately, much good can be done to the world. The differences of learned people aggravate the differences among common people, with the result that miseries increase and happiness decreases. This evil which is pleasing to the selfish people, has drowned all people into the ocean of miseries.

(Intr. 8 pp. 3-4)

We wish that all men may regard as good, what is really good, and bad what is really bad; neither anybody may lay false accusations at another man's door, nor thwart the propagation of truth. In spite of the illumination of truth and untruth, anybody has the option of believing or non-believing; there is no compulsion. It is the way of all good men that they look upon the faults of others and their own, as faults, and merits as merits, quit the fault and accept the merits, and minimize the fanaticism of the fanatics. For what evil is there that has not been perpetrated in the past or is not being perpetrated in the present by religious bigotry? The truth is that it is highly unhuman to deprive oneself as well as others

of the real good, by causing injury to others in this uncertain and transient life.

(*Sub Preface 4. p.p. 761-762*)

These are the four determinants of right conduct :—1st the Veda ; 2nd the *Smṛtis* made by master-minds and in agreement with the Vedas such as *Manusmṛti* ; 3rd the conduct of the righteous person which has come to us as tradition from the beginning of the universe, i. e., conduct enjoined by God through the Vedas; 4th that which conforms with our conscience, e. g., truthfulness. These are the criteria of virtue. Impartial justice, acceptance of truth, total abandonment of untruth—such conduct is Dharma (religion). And whatever is reverse of this, i. e., partiality, injustice, disregard of truth, and acceptance of untruth—this is all a dharma, (vice or unrighteousness).

(III *45. p. 79*).

INDIA OR THE ARYAVARTTA

Q.—Which is the place where man was first created.

A.—In *Triviṣṭapa*, which is now known as Tibet.

Q.—In the beginning, was there one caste (class) or many ?

A.—Only one-man-class. Later, on according to the saying of Rg Veda (1-51-8) "*Vijānī hyāryānye cha dasyavaḥ*," (Distinguish the Āryas from those who are Dasyus) there became two classes, Ārya, i. e., learned and virtuous, and Dasyus, i. e., evil doers and ignorant. According to the Atharva Veda (*uta shūdra uta Ārye*) the aryas were divided into four classes, Brāhmaṇa, Kṣattirīya Vaishya and Shūdra. The twice-born or educated persons came to be known as Aryas and the ignorant as *Shūdra* or *anāri* (=*anārya* or non-*ārya*),

Q.—How did they, then, come here ?

A.—There arose constant quarrels between the Devas or Āryas who were educated, and Asuras or Dasyus who were uncultured. When troubles increased, the Āryas selected this part of the globe as the most excellent and settled in it. Since then it is called by the name *Ārya vartta*."

(*VIII 46, 47, pp. 314-15*)

From the dawn of creation upto a little before five thousand years ago, the Āryas were the sole overlords of the whole world. There were dependent rulers in other countries. From the *Manusmṛti* which was composed in the beginning of the world, it is evident that upto the time of the *Kauravas* and *Pāṇḍavas*, the rulers and people of the whole world were under the Government of this country. The *Manusmṛti* says: "Let all men of the world, the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Kṣattriyas*, the *Vaishyas*, the *Shudras*, *Dasyus*, *mlechchhas* etc., receive instructions in their various trades, rules of conduct suited to their respective stations in life and acquire knowledge from the *Brāhmaṇas* (i. e., learned men) born in India."

Upto the days of the *Rājasūya yajña* celebrated by the Emperor *Yudhiṣṭhira* after the war of the *Mahābhārata* all countries were under the Government of this country. *Bhagadatta* of China, *Babruvāhana* of America, *Vīdālākṣā* of Europe (literally cat-eyed), the *Yavanas* of Greece, *Shalya* of Persia and other kings participated in the *Rājasūya yajña* and war of *Mahābhārata* under orders (from the central government). In the reign of *Raghugaṇa* *Rāvaṇa* was also under them. When in the times of Rāmachandra, he revolted, Rāmachandra punished him and after killing him gave his principality to his brother *Bibhīṣaṇa*. From the emperor *Svāyambhava*, upto the *Pāṇḍāvas*, the sovereignty of the world was in the hands of the Āryas. After that, they fought with each other and perished.

(*XI. 5. 6. pp.* 387–88)

In this world of God, the proud, the unjust and the uneducated cannot rule for a long time. It is the natural tendency of the world, that when riches increase beyond measure, there increase with them, idleness, inactivity, jealousy, hatred, sensuality and pride. Education and culture receive a set-back, evil qualities and pernicious habits grow more and more. For example, wine-drinking flesh-eating, early-marriage and all sorts of irregularities

come into vogue. When the military is very skilfull and the army is raised to such an extent that nobody dare face it, then they become partial and proud and consequently unjust.

(*XI. 7. p. 388*).

When these evils creep in, mutual hostilities lead to their downfall and from lesser families arises some one who may put an end to their Government, e. g., Sivaji and Guru Govinda Singh rose in the times of the Moghal emperors and smashed to pieces their whole empire.

(*XI. 8. p. 389*)

From the beginning of the universe till the *Mahābhārata*, the world ruling dynasties were all Ārya. Now misfortune has over-shadowed their descendants and their kingdoms having been lost, they are down-trodden under the heel of the foreigners. In the above passage there is a mention of the following Chakravartti* emperors of the world as *Sudyumna, Bhūridyumna, Indradyumna, Kuvalayāshva, Yauvonāshva, Vaddhryashva, Ashvapati, Shashavindu, Harishchandra Ambarīṣa, Nanaktu, Saryāti, Yayāti, Anaraṇya, Akṣasena, Marutta, Bharata*. In the *Manusmṛti*, the *Mahābhārata* etc., there is a clear mention of the chakravartti emperors such as Svāyambhava.

(*XI. 9. p. 389*)

But the war of the *Mahābhāratā* gave such a big shock to this country, that even now it could not recover its former position. When brother kills brother then destruction is inevitable.

"*Vināsha kāle viparīta buddhiḥ*" (*Vṛiddhachāṇakya XVI*, 17).

A poet says that when the time of destruction comes, mind is upset and people begin to do just the wrong thing. If they are given a right sort of advice, they think it wrong

and if wrong, they think it write. When men of a great learning, princes, kings, sages, saint, were killed in the Great War or died, then the teaching and preaching of the Vedic literature and the Vedic religion became extinct. Jealousy, enmity and pride became the order of the day. He who found himself strong took possession of the country and became its king. The whole of India was split up into small pieces. In such a state, who could have looked to the affairs of foreign principalities. When the *Brāhmaṇas* went without education, the condition of the *kṣattriyas*, *vaishyas*, shūdras became unspeakable. The tradition of studying Vedic scriptures rationally came to a close. Only the Brāhmaṇas continued reciting them by rote for earning their bread. That mere reading was also denied to the *kṣattriyas* and others. For when uneducated persons became preceptors, hypocrisly, fraud and vices got an upper hand. The Brāhmaṇas thought that something should be done for earning livelihood. They held councils and decided to preach to the kṣattriyas etc., "We are your objects of worship. Without serving us you cannot get heaven or salvation. If you will not serve us, you will be sent to the terrible hell." The epithets 'Brāhmaṇa' and 'venerable,' which according to the Vedas and books of sages, were applicable to only those who were most learned and pious, came to be usurped by these ignorant, sensual, hypocritical, irresponsible and vicious people.

(*XI. 14. p. 392-393*)

Now due to ill-luck and idleness, vanity, as well as mutual animosities, the Aryas have come to such a pass, that, not to speak of ruling over foreign countries, they do not enjoy at present the indivisible, independent, free and fearless sway even over their own homes. Whatever little is left is also down trodden by the outsiders. Very few rulers are independent. When evil days come, country-men have to suffer all sorts of troubles. Whatever may one do, the indigenous rule is always the best.

Foreign government cannot be perfectly beneficial even when it is free from religious bias, race-prejudice, and embued with parental justice and mercy. It is very hard to shake off linguistic differences, cultural angularities, and estrangement due to customs and manners ; although unless it is done, it is difficult to derive the fullest benefit and achieve the goal in view.

(*VIII. 51. p. 317-18*)

Q.—Is class distinction God-made or man-made?

A.—God-made as well as man-made.

Q.—Which is God-made and which is man-made?

A.—The classes man, animals, birds, trees, water-animals etc. are God-made. Then again the sub-division of animals into cows, horses, elephants etc ; of trees into pipal, banyan, mango etc ; of birds into geese, crows, herons etc. ; of water-animals into fish, allegator etc. are also God-made. Similarly sub-divisions of man into *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣattriya*, *Vaishya*, *Shūdra*, low-caste are also God-made. But the sub-classes of men into *Brāhmaṇas* etc. are not generic, but specific, (i. e. not of outer form but of inner nature. Tr.) The distinction of classes should be on the basis of qualifications, activities and temperaments, as we have described under the heading *varṇāshrama*. In this, man's part is only so much that the government and a syndicate of learned persons should decide after examination as to which is *Brāhmaṇa*, which *Kṣattriya*, which *Vaishya* and which *Shūdra*.

The same case is applicable to the distinction of food. It is also God-made and man-made. A lion is carnivourous and a buffalo, herbivorous. This is God-made distinction. But the differentiation of foods on the basis of time, and place or availability is man-made.

(*XI. 133 p. 549*)

Q.—We see that the Europeans have made so much progress because they wear round-toed shoes, coats, pants etc. and eat in hotels, food cooked by any person.

A.—You are mistaken, Moslems and low caste people eat food cooked by any one, yet they have made no progress. The advancement of the Europeans is due to the following points : absence of early marriage; good education of boys and girls both; marriage according to the choice of the married couple; no preaching by undesirable persons; they educate themselves and do not fall into the snares of anybody; whatever they do, is done with mutual consulation; they devote their body, soul and wealth to the well-being of their country; they are not indolent and work very hard; they allow into their offices and courts only English shoes and not Indian shoes. This one point is sufficient to show how patriotic they are—they respect the shoes of their country more than they respect the men of other countries. These Europeans have come into this country for a little more than a hundred years, yet they wear coarse clothes as they do in their own country. They have not forsaken the ways of their country. Many of you have copied their ways. This shows that they are wise and you are foolish. Copying is not a sign of wisdom. These Europeans are very dutiful and well disciplined. They always help the trade of their country. These qualifications and deeds have contributed to their advancement, and not round toed shoes, coat, pant, eating in hotels, or other evils.

And see, they have class distinction also. When a European marries a foreign girl or a European girl marries a foreign man, however big and respectable they may be, they cease to be invited to dinners by other Europeans. What is it if not a class distinction ? They exploit your simplicity when they say that they have no class-distinctions, and you readily believe them owing to your simplicity. Therefore, whatever is done should be done after full consideration, so that one may not regret afterwards.

Physicians and medicines are required to sick persons and not for the healthy. An educated person is healthy and an uneducated person is suffering from disease of

ignorance; sound education and good preaching are its remedies. It is your ignorance that you think that one's religion depends on eating or drinking. When you see anybody riding rough-shod over food restrictions, you think that he has lost his religion. You neither hear him nor go to him, nor allow him to come to you. Now tell me whether your learning is for your selfish ends or for the good of others. Your benevolence required that you would benefit them with your teachings. If you say that these persons do not make use of your teaching, it is your mistake. Had you kept your character in tact, they might have loved you and been grateful to you; it is your great fault that you looked to your interest only and not to the interests of your society. Virtue lies in doing good to others and vice in doing them harm. Therefore, learned men ought to be a sort of boat for the ignorant people to cross the ocean of ignorance. They should not behave like uneducated persons. They should do only such acts as lead gradually to their advancement as well as that of others.

(*XI. 134. pp. 549–551*)

EDUCATION

It is very essential for the mother and the father that before during and after the conception, they should avoid the use of intoxicants, liquor, foul-smelling, dry and such substances as are injurious to mental development and should take only such things as contribute towards calmness, health, strength, wisdom, energy, civility and gentleness, e. g., clarified butter, milk, sweets and other useful substances of food and drink, so that the generative juices of the mother and the father be healthy and free from disease. Out of the first sixteen days from the beginning of the monthly course, the first four are forbidden. Of the remaining twelve, the 11th and 13th dates of the lunar months should also be avoided. The rest ten are the best nights for affecting conception. This means that there should be no co-habitation after the sixteenth day from the beginning of the monthly course. The man and wife should not come together until the same dates recur next month, nor till a complete year has elapsed after the conception. They should co-habit only when they are perfectly healthy, in full mutual agreement and free from all sorts of anxieties.

(II. 2. p. 42-43)

It is the chief business of the mother, the father, the preceptor and the relations that they should decorate

their children with the ornaments of highest education, training, qualities actions and habits. The soul of a man can never be beautified by wearing ornaments made of gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, coral etc. as the wearing of ornaments leads only to physical vanity, sensuality fear of theives and possibly to death also. It is seen in the wotld that for the sake of ornaments, children meet their death at the hands of evil-doers.

(*III. 1. p. 55*)

The place of study should be secluded and girls' and boys' school should be two *kosas* (about four miles) apart. The teachers, servants and menials should all be females in girls' schools and males in boys' schools. No boy of five years' age should be allowed an entry into girls' schools, nor a girl of that age in a boys, school. It means that as long as they are *Brahmachārīs* (male students) and *Brahma-chāriṇīs* (female students), they should keep themselves aloof from eight kinds of sensualities—looking at the person of opposite sex, contactual relation, private meeting, conversation, love-story-telling, intercourse, contemplation of a tempting object and company. The teachers should also keep them away from the above mentioned things, so that they may increase their happiness by attaining sound education, training, refined manners, good habits and strength of body and the soul.

(*III. 4. p. 56*)

There should be some law of the state or a rule of the society that no man could keep his son or daughter at home beyond the age of five or eight years. They must send them to school. And if they do not, they should be penalized.

(*III. 6. p. 57*)

Male and female students should avoid wine, flesh, scents, garlands, metallic medicines, company of opposite ex, all acids, violence to creatures, rubbing the parts of

the body and unnecessarily touching the sexual organs, the use of collyrium in the eye, shoes, umbrella, lust, anger, greed, attachment, fear, sorrow, jealousy, malice, dance, vocal and instrumental music, gambling, pratling, and recrimination, lying gazing at opposite sex, dependence and injury to others. They should always sleep singly, and should not allow their vital fluid to flow out. If a man wastes his semen throught lust, he brings to naught vow of Brahmacharya.

(*III. 42. p. 76*)

The teacher enjoins male and female pupils thus :— always speak the truth ; do righteous deeds ; study without being indolent ; acquire all knowledge after keeping your *Brahmacharya* in tact, i. e., preserving vital fluid ; bring presents to the precepter ; and then only enter married life and beget children ; never be away from truth through indolence ; never forsake righteousness through indolence; never lose sight of health and mental equilibrium through indolence ; never slacken the proper development of your excellent talents through indolence ; never betray slackness in the service of the godly and learned persons, mother, father and the like ; do show regard to the learned, and serve like-wise mother, father, preceptor and guests on all occasions: whatever actions are unobjectionable and righteous, them you should do, e. g., truthfulness etc ; never have recourse to those actions which are contrary to the above, such as falsehood etc., copy only those actions of ours which are good, i. e., tally with the rules of conduct never copy our improper actions ; associate with only those persons in our midst who are learned and virtuous *Brāhmaṇas* ; and have confidence on them alone ; give (charity) through faith ; give through no-faith; give through gracefulness; give through shame ; give through fear ; and give through promise ; if you ever fall into any doubt about duty, behaviour, mode of worship or acquisition of knowledge, then who-ever are wise, impartial, *yogins* or *non-yogins*, soft-hearted, lovers ofr ighteousness and noble-

souled people, just as they do, so should you do. This is injunction, this is order, this is advice, this the secret of the *Veda*, and this is instruction. Thus should you behave and thus should you build your character.

(*III. 43. p.* 77-78)

Those things which stand in the way of studies should be carefully abstained from, e. g , evil company or association with bad and sexual persons; bad habits such as drink and prostitution ; early marriage, i. e., the marriage of a male before the age of twenty five, and that of a female before the age of sixteen ; violation of Brahmacharya or sexual uncleanliness ; aversion of the king, the parents, the men of learning, and the scared books ; over-eating ; over-walking, indolence or insincerity in examination; absence of consciousness of the value of learning; disbelief in the Brahmacharya being the chief means of strength, wisdom, prowess health, government and wealth; wasting time in the worship of idols etc. in place of the worship of God : the reverse of venerating the parents, the preceptor, and other men of learning by believing them as the true objects of worship : violation of the rules of varṇas and āshramas and replacing them by the following absurdities as different kinds of sandal-pastes on the forehead—one straight line, or three lines, or tilaks, wearing of *kaṇṭhis* (necklaces made of the wood of Tulsi plant etc.) and rosaries ; fast of the 11th or 13th of the month ; pilgrimage to Benares etc.; faith in the efficacy of the recitation of names *Rāma*, *Kṛṣṇa*, *Nārāyaṇa*, Shiva, Bhagavati, Gaṇesha etc., in the removal of suns ; disbelief in learning due to the teachings of hypocrites ; belief in the reading of spurious *Purāṇas* as the means of salvation without learning, righteousness, yoga and God's worship ; greed of wealth aversion for learning ; wandering aimlessly. Such undesirable ways of living deprive students of the benefits of Brahmacharya and learning and keep them unhealthy and ignorant.

(*III. 97. p. 108*)

Q.—Should women and *shūdra* (low caste) also study the Vedas? If they would do so, what is left for us to do? Besides, there is no authority to permit such things. Here is a clear prohibition :—

Strī-shūdrau nādhīyatam-iti-shrutiḥ.

It means that women and *shūdras* should not read.

A.—Females and males both have a right to be educated—all men without distinction. You may fall into the well. The authority quoted by you is from no authoritative and reliable scriptures. It is your own creation. The second verse of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Yajurveda clearly gives to all men equal rights of reading and hearing the Vedas and other sacred books. The verse is as follows :—

Yathemām vācham kalyāṇīm āvandāni janebhyaḥ;
Brahma-rājanyābhyām shūdrāya chāryāya cha svāya-chāraṇāya.

God says:—Just as I give to all men this word (teaching) in the form of Rg-veda etc. (four Vedas), which gives wordly prosperity and ex-wordly bliss, similarly, should you too transmit it to others.

Q.—Here the word '*jana*' stands only for the twice-born as smṛtis permit the teaching of the Vedas only to the *Brāhmaṇas, Kṣattriyas* and *Vaishyas.*

A.—God Himself says that. He has given the Vedas for the benefit of *Brahma-rājanyābhyām* (Brahmana's and the Kṣattriyas), *aryāya* (vaishyas), *shūdrāya* (Shūdras), *svāya* (own persons such as servants, maids etc.), and *araṇāya* (the lowliest). It means that all persons should read and hear the Vedas, increase their knowledge, accept good things, quit bad habits, and be happy. Shall we obey your instructions or of God? God's instructions are undoubtedly to be obeyed. Anybody who does not do so is an atheist. Does not God want to do good to the shūdra? Is God so partial that He permits the reading of the Vedas only to the twice-born and not to the shūdras? Had God

designed to prohibit teaching in case of the shūdras, He should not have endowed them with tongue and ears. Just as God has made the earth, water, fire, air, the moon, the sun, corn and other objects for all, similarly He has revealed the Vedas too for all. And wherever there is prohibition, it simply means that he who is incapacitated to drive the benefit of education, and in spite of teaching, remains ignorant and silly, is called *shūdra*. Teaching is of no avail in his case. As to the prohibition in case of women, it is all due to your ignorance, selfishness and folly. See the Vedas allow the teaching of girls in the following verse:—

Brahmacharyeṇa kanyā yuvānam vindate patim.
(*Atharvaveda* XI, 24, 3, 18).

Just as boys after completing their full course of Brahmacharya and education marry fully grown up, and well educated girls of the like temperaments, so should girls observe Brahmacharya, acquire full knowledge of the Vedas and their teachings, attain to the age of maturity and accept in marriage fully grown up youths of profound learning and of like temperaments. This shows that women should also practise Brahmacharya and read the Vedas.

Q.—Should women also read the Vedas ?

A.—Surely. We find in the Shrauta Sūtras :—

Imam mantram paṭhet.

"Let the wife read this mantra in the yajña."

If women are not taught the scriptures including the Vedas, how would they read the mantras with proper accents and speak sanskṛta on the occasion of yajña ? It is clearly written in the Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa that *Gārgī* etc., who were the gems among the women of India, became learned only after reading the Vedas and other scriptures. If men are educated and women uneducated or women educated and men uneducated, then the house would be a place of constant warfare between the gods

and demons and there would be no happiness. If women are not taught, how will they be able to work as teachers in girls' schools ? Nor can they take part in the affairs of the Government or in the administration of justice and the like. Household affairs, conjugal happiness, and home-keeping are the things which can never be satisfactorily accomplished unless women are well educated.

It is a fact that the wives of the royal families of the ancient *Āryāvartta* were well-up in the art of war, otherwise how is it that Kaikeyi etc. participated in the battle with their husbands, Dasharatha etc. ? Therefore, a *Brāhmaṇa* woman and a *Kṣattriya* woman should learn all sciences; a vaishya woman should learn commerce and a Shūdra woman the art of service. Just as men should learn at least grammar, theology and the principles of their profession, similarly, women should necessarily learn grammar, thelogy, medicine, arithmetic and art. Without this much, it is not possible to ascertain what is right and what is wrong, what sort of treatment should be offered to the husband and others, how should children be borne, bred and brought up, how household affairs should be carried on, how food should be prepared by hygienic methods, and how disease should be kept out and happiness secured in the family. The study of mechanical art is necessary for the construction of the house and for the making of dress, ornaments etc. Arithmetic is necessary for keeping family accounts. Without the study of the Vedas and scriptures it is not possible to understand religious duties and worship of God and to avoid the doing of unrighteous acts. Therefore, they alone deserve our thanks and realise the full advantage of their lives who enable their children to observe Brahmacharya, get sound education, develop their body and mind and behave mannerly with parents, husband, mother in-law, father-in-law, king people neighbours, friends and children. The treasure of learning is imperishable. It increases by giving. Other treasures decrease by spending and co-sharers also take away their share. Learning can neither be stolen nor

partitioned. The duty of guarding this treasure is mainly of the king and ordinarily of the people too.

Kanyānām sampradānam cha kumāraṇām cha rakṣaṇam. (*Manusmṛti* VII, 152).

It is the duty of the king to arrange that girls and boys both should practise Brahmacharya and receive education from such and such age up to such and such age. The recalcitrant parents should be penalised. Nobody should be allowed, under state rules, to keep his daughter and son at home after the age of eight years. They must be sent to school and should not be allowed to marry before the completion of education or Samāvarttana Sanskāra,

Sarveṣāmevadānānām brahmadānam vishiṣyate; Vary-anna gomahī-vāsas-tila-kāñchana-sarpiṣām.

(*Manusmṛti*, IV, 233)

The charity of teaching the Vedas is the best of all charities—i. e., of water, food, cow, lands, clothes, oil-seeds, gold, butter, etc. Therefore, all sorts of sacrifices of body mind and money should be made for propagation of education. That country is fortunate in which Brahmacharya and Vedic learning are properly propagated.

(*III. 99, 100, 101 pp. 110–113*)

SUPERSTITIONS CONDEMNED

As the ignorant people are deprived of the benefit of studying, hearing or thinking, about the sciences of physiology and physics, they attribute to ghosts and evil spirits, the physical diseases such as delirium and fever and mental diseases such as insanity. Instead of using due medicines or taking proper care, they repose their confidence in knavish, hypocritical, foolish, bad charactered selfish, low-born *Bhangīs, Chamārs*, mlechchas etc., fall prey to all sorts of tricks, cheatings, dissimulation, eating of leavings, use of enchanted threads or false *Mantra Tantra* (mystic formulas.)

This leads to waste of money, miserable condition of the children etc. and augmentation of disease and sufferings.

(II. 9. p. 46)

Those who uphold the mystic cults of exercising magic formulas for winning affection, killing (the enemy), cheating dominating over the mind of others etc., etc., should be looked upon as the greatest rogues. The children should be told in their very infancy what is the real significance of these fraudulent practices so that they may not fall into the snares of anyone and suffer accordingly.

(II. 12 p. 50)

No body should repose confidence in imposters nor should he serve them.

The following are the characteristics of imposters:—

(1) Those who do nothing good, but cheat people in the name of religion and piety.

(2) Ever greedy.

(3) Fraudulant.

(4) Who bluff of their own superiority in the presence of ordinary public.

(5) Who do injury to others and are of malicious nature.

(6) Popularity hunters—those who associate with all men, good or bad, indiscriminately.

These six ought to be regarded cat-natured.

(7) Those who always keep their eye down for the sake of reputation.

(8) The vindictive, such as are ready ever to kill a man in return for a slight injury.

(9) The unscrupulous—Those who serve their ends with all sorts of unfair means—cheating, betrayal of confidence etc.

(10) Those who are not open to conviction and cling to their opinions obstinately, however wrong they may be.

(11) Those who falsely assume an air of humanity, contentment and piety.

These five are stork-natured.

(IV. 58 pp. 155-156.)

—:o:—

MARRIAGE & MARRIED LIFE

That man or woman is entitled to enter the family life who has practised Brahmacharya in accordance with the preceptor's instructions, has read all the four, or three, or two or at least one Veda with their auxiliary literature with righteousness and who has chastity.

(*IV. 1. p. 114*).

The merits and demerits of a near or distant marriage are as follows :—

(1) The marriage between those persons is never happy who have been constantly together from their very boyhood; who have played, quarrelled, and loved; who have known each other's merits, demerits, and nature, and aberrations of immature life and who have seen each other even in their nakedness.

(2) Just as water mixed with water does not give rise to a new quality, similarly, marriage within the father's or the mother's family is not conducive to desired growth due to the absence of necessary variation in blood.

(3) Just as milk improves by the mixture of sugar or other ingredients such as *sonṭha* (ginger), similarly, the couple to be married should to be beyond the pale of the mother's and the father's families.

(4) The change of habital and climate often has a remedial influence on diseases. Similarly, there is an advantage in the distant marriages.

(5) Near relationship is open to the risk of contagion of joys and sorrows and even of disputes. This danger is absent in case of distant relations. Besides, distant marriages add to the intensity of mutual affection, and not so the near ones

(6) Distant marriages also lead to the interchange of manners and productions among distant people. Therefore, has it been said :—

Duhitā, dūrhitā dūrehitā bhavatīti.

(*Niruktā, III, 4*).

A girl is called *duhitā* (daughter) because it is always good to marry her at a distant place, and not in near one.

(7) Near-marriages might also cause poverty to her parent's family as she might go there too often and the parents be obliged to give her presents every now and then.

(8) Proximity might create a consciousness of vanity in the mind of the wife and lead to disruption or inequanimity. A triffling difference might tempt the wife to run to her father's house; complaints might arise and the gulf between the two families might be widened. Female are well known for their tender and excitable feelings. For these reasons, marriage connections should not be held in the father's family, within the mother's six generations and in near localities.

(*IV. 4. pp. 115-116*).

The most suitable age for marriage is from the sixteenth up to the twenty-fourth, in case of female, and from twenty fifth to forty-eighth in case of males If the bride is sixteenth and bride-groom twenty-five this is the lowest type of marriage; if the woman is eighteenth or twenty and man thirty, thirty-five or forty, it is middling, if the wife is twenty-four and the husband forty-eight, it is the best. That country is prosperous in which marriages take place at a suitable age and the practice of *brahma-*

charya and education is fully observed. But that country is sunk in misery in which brahmacharya and education are neglected and marriages take place in early age or between unsuitable matches. The reform of all reforms is the reform of marriage i. e, marriages should take place only after full education and brahmacharya.*

(*IV. 8. p. 118*).

11. *Q.*—Should the marriage business be in the hands of parents or in the hands of boys and girls themselves ?

A.—It is the best to give full liberty to the boy and the girl. Even if the parents contemplate marrying their children, they should not do so without the full consent of the children. Marriage with mutual consent is susceptible to the least disruption and conducive to the birth of excellent progeny. Marriages against liking always leads to constant quarrels. It is the bride and the bride-groom that have the chief concern in a marriage and not the mother or the father; it is the marrying couple that enjoys pleasure by mutual love and suffers pain from discord.

(*IV. 11. p. 121, 122*).

Fortune and prosperity attend only on that family wherein the husband is satisfied with the wife and the wife with the husband.

If the wife does not love the husband and is unable to please him, then no amorous desire is produced in the husband.

When the wife is happy, then the whole family is happpy.

When the wife is unhappy then all the others are unhappy.

(*IV. 38 p. 140*).

---

* Sanskara Vidhi. Garbhadhan Vidhi

Father, brother, husband and brother-in-law who are desirous of having a prosperous home should keep their ladies well contented with honourable treatment, ornaments etc.

The family in which ladies are honourably treated produces men of learning. They are called devas and live a happy life. But no success attends upon such families wherein ladies are not respected.

That family is speedily ruined in which women-folk come to grief. That family always prospers wherein women-folk are happy and hopeful.

(*IV 39. pp. 140-141*).

It behoves a woman to very cheerfully attend to the various household duties, to prepare articles properly and to look to house-cleanliness. She should get the food prepared cleanly and hygienically, so that it may work as medicine against the disease of the body and the mind. She should keep proper account of expenses and bring it to the notice of her husband. She should take proper work from the menials and should not allow anything to go wrong.

(*IV 40, p. 141*)..

Husband and wife should never live seperately.

The following six vices spoil women :—

Pānam durjana sansargaḥ patyā cha viraho·tanam.
Svapno-nyageha vāsashsch nāṛi sanduṣaṇām ṣaṭ.

(*Manu.* IX, 13)

(1) The house of liquor or other intoxicants such as *bhāṅg**, (2) company of evil men, (3) Seperation from the husband, (4) wandering aimlessly here and there with the pretext of seeing ascetics etc., (5) sleeping and (6) living in another man's house.

These evils spoil men too. The seperation between husband and the wife is on two accounts; first going

elsewhere on business, and secondly death. In the first case the best thing is, that if the husband goes abroad he should take with him his wife also, the principle being that there should be no seperation for a long time.

(IV 72 p. 163)

Just as rivers and rivulets wander hither and thither without any settlement, until they reach the ocean, similarly the house-holder's life is the basis of all other āshramas. They cannot do their proper work without the support of the house-holders. It is the house-holders that provide the *brahmachārins* (students), *vānaprasthins* (recluses) and *sanyāsins* (renuncients) with their daily necessaries. Therefore the *gṛahastha āshrama* (family life) is the highest. Therefore, all who desire worldly prosperity and ex-worldly bliss should try to enter the house-holder's life. The house-holder's duties can not be performed by weaklings and cowards. Therefore, competency has to be attained to enter the house-holder's life. All that is going on in the world has its support in the house-holder's life. Had there been no house-holders to procreate progeny, wherefrom could there have existed the *brahmacharya*, the *vānprastha* aud the *ṣanyās.* He who condemns the gṛahasth or family-life is himself condemnable. He who appreciates it is worth being appreciated. But family life is happy only when the husband and the wife are well-educated, industrious and well-versed in worldly affairs. Therefore, brahmacharya and svayamvara marriage are greatly instrumental in the achievement of family happiness.

(IV. 99. p. 178)).

VEDIC LIBRARY ARYA SAMAJ, SAN

RIGIDITY OF CASTE CONDEMNED

If a man born in a Shūdra family possesses the merits, actions and temperaments of a *brāhmaṇa*, a *ksattriya* or a *vaishya*, he becomes a *brāhmaṇa*, a *kṣattriya* or a *vaishya* as the case may be. Similarly, man born in a *brāhmaṇa, kṣattriya* or *vaishya* family should become a shūdra if his merits, actions and temperaments are shūdra-like.

It means that a man or a woman should belong only to that varṇa for which he or she is fit.

(*IV 23. p. 129*)

Among the four *varṇas*, there should be mutual affection, regard for one another's good, happy relations and fellow feeling on occasions of enjoyments, sorrow, profit, and loss.

They should with one mind and at all cost devote themselves to the well-being of the state and the people.

(*IV 71 p. 163*).

Q.—Are the *Brāhma Samāja* and the *Prārthāna Samāja* good ?

A.—Partly good. But there are many demerits also.

Q.—The *Brāhma Samāja* and *Prārthanā Samāja* are all good. Their principles are very good.

A.—I. They are not good in all respects. How can the principles of those who are unaware of the Vedic lore be

all good. They saved many persons from the clutches of Christianity, they removed idolatory also to a certain extent, and they protected people from the snares of certain spurious scriptures. These are all good points. But they are lacking in patriotism. They have borrowed much from Christianity in their ways of living. They have also changed the rules of marriage etc.

Instead of praising their country and glorifying their ancestors, they speak ill of them. In their lectures they eulogize Christians and Englishmen. They do not even mention the names of old sages, *Brahmā* etc. But they say that there was never a learned man like the English people from the very creation of the world, that Indians have all along remained ignorant, and that they never made any progress.

Not only do they not respect the Vedas etc. but they do not desist from condemning them. The books of the *Brāhma Samāja* include among the saint Christ, Moses, Mohammad, *Nānāka* and *Chaitanyā*. They do not mention even the name of *ṛshis* and sages of ancient India. This shows that their religion also derives its tenets from the personages whose names have been mentioned in their books. When they are born in the *Āryāvartta*, they have eaten food and drunk water of this country, and are still doing the same, it does not behave them to abandon the path of their ancestors and incline to alien faiths. The *Brāhma Samājists* and *Prārthanā Samājists* call themselves educated, though they have no knowledge of the literature of their own country, i. e. Sanskṛta. No permanent sort of reform is expected from those who, in their pride for English education, are ready to launch a new religion.

4. They observe no restrictions of interdining with Englishmen, Moslems and low class people. They are perhaps under the impression that they and their country would be regenerated simply by removing the restrictions of food and caste.

(*XI 132 pp. 547–49*)

CASTE & FOREIGN TRAVELS

Q.—Do the inhabitants of the *Āryāvartta* soil their conduct by going to the countries outside the *Āryāvartta* ?

A.—It is all bosh. If a man preserves his internal and external purity and follows the rules of conduct such as truthfulness etc. his conduct is never soiled in whatever country he may live, and if he does evil things even in the *Āryāvartta*, he falls down in his character.

In ancient times, the people of *Āryāvartta* travelled all over the globe for political and trade purposes. The boggie of untouchability and loss of religion current in these days is due to misrepresentation and ignorance. Those people, who do not hesitate to go to other countries, come in contact of various people, know their customs and manners, expand their kingdom and business, acquire boldness, imbibe their merits, shake of their own weakness, and thus become powerful. When you see no loss of religion in intercourse with low-born, mean and dirty persons as prostitutes and others and have scruples in coming in contact with excellent persons of foreign countries, what is it if not your ignorance ? One thing we admit of course. Those who eat flesh and drink wine have their bodies, virile fluid and other bodily elements corrupted. In coming in contact with them there is a risk of the Aryas contracting those evil habits. But if they accept their good points and leave their bad points, then there is no harm in associating with them. Some fools hold it as sinful to even touch or see them. It is why they cannot win war against them as sight and touch become indispensible in the case of war. Good conduct comprises of the abandonment of infatuation, aversion, injustice, falsehood and other evil habits and imbibing of non-violence, love, benevolence, gentleness etc. It should be noted down that religion is the concern of our soul and our dutifulness. If our actions are good, there is no harm in going to foreign lands. Harm there is in sinful deeds. But there is one thing. They should make themselves conversant with the beauties of

the Vedic faith and demerits of spurious religions, so that nobody might mislead them.

Can any country prosper without extending its rule and trade to foreign countries? Nothing can be expected except poverty and misery when our countrymen trade only in their own country and trade and rule of the country are in foreign hands. Religious imposters think that if they would educate the people and allow them to go to foreign lands, then the latter would become wiser, would not fall into the meshes of their fraud, and the former would consequently lose their importance as well as their livelihood. It is why they impose restrictions on inter-dining and fashion of dress and object to foreign travels. But it should be a strict rule with them that in no circumstances whatsoever they take flesh and wine. Has it not been a unanimous verdict of wise men that to cook and eat food within the *chaukā** even at the time of battle is the sure cause of defeat? The good conduct of a *kṣattriya* lies in conquering the enemy in the battle, by all possible means on horseback, elephants, chariots, or even on foot, eating bread and drinking water with one hand and killing the enemy with the other. The greatest loss of religion for a *kṣattriya* is his defeat in the battle-field. The stupidity of the observance of these *chaukā* restrictions and consequent accentuation of differences has cost these people their independence, their happiness, their prosperity, their kingdom, their knowledge and their enterprise. Now they have come to this pass that they are sitting hand on hand (idly) in the hope that some thing may come in their way which they may cook and eat. But as they get nothing, it is obvious that their *chaukā* scruples have brought destruction to the whole of India. One thing is, no doubt necessary. The place of taking meals should be duly swept and its dirt removed, plastered, washed and kept clean. The kitchens should not be kept dirty as is usual with Moslems and Christians.

(*X. 7, 8, 9, pp. 369-72*)

Q.—Should one eat food cooked with one's own hands only and not cooked by someone else.

A.—If food is cooked in cleanly manner, there is no harm in dining with all Aryas. If *Brāhmaṇas* and high class men waste their time in cooking food, cleansing utensils, or washing kitchen, no progress can be made in knowledge or other advantageous pursuits. In the *Rājsūya yajna* of Emperor *Yudhiṣthira* kings, sages saints and other guests came from all quaters of the globe and took food in the same kitchen The food scruples have risen up from the time the Mohammadon and Christian religions made their preachings, difference arose and drinking and eating of cow-flesh etc. were introduced. The Royal families of the Aryāvartta came into martrimonial and other relations with the people of Kabul, Kandhara, Iran, America, Europe and other countries and married princesses *Gāndhari*, *Mādri*, *Ulopī* etc. *Shakuni* etc. dined with the *Kauravas* and *Paṇḍavas* and there were no differences. For in those days there was one Vedic religion in the whole world and all had faith in it. They sympathised with each other in pleasure and pain, profit and loss. There was happiness in the whole world. Now multiplicity of religions has led to much happiness and great discord. It is the duty of wise men to find means to end it. May God sow in our minds the seed of true religion that false religions may disappear and wise men may give up their hostilities and increase happiness.

(X. 25. p. 381)

—:o:—

GOVERNMENT

The object in view is that one man should not possess the absolute power of government. Let the king be the President of the Assembly under him and be under the assembly, he and the assembly both under the people and the people under the assembly.

If the ruling class be independent of the people, it will interfere and bring ruin upon the people. The absolute monarch, intoxicated with power, ruins the subjects and eats them up. There should be no absolute and unrestricted power. Just as a lion or other flesh eating beasts kill and devour fat and well grown animals, similarly an absolute monarch destroys the state. He does not allow anybody to out-grow himself. He robs the wealthy by dealing out uujust punishment.

(VI. 3. p. 199).

God says "O rulers, may your fire-arms, guns, cannon, bows, and arrows, sword etc. be strong enough to check and vanquish the enemy; may your army do its work with credit, so you may be always victorious. But victory may not attend upon those who are unjust and condemnable." This means that the state flourishes as long as people are righteous and declines when they become wicked.

(VI 6. p. 200).

There should be seven or eight ministers of the following qualifications:—indigenous (born in the same country

Veda-versed, fearless, of definite aims, of respectable families, well tried.

Even easy things are difficult for only one man, specially when he is unaided. Much more so a vast empire. Therefore, it is bad to make one man the absolute monarch or to depand upon one man for the management of the state.

(*VI 11. p. 208*)

There can be no ruler without the ruled and no ruled without the ruler. Each should be independent in there own spheres and interdependent in common affairs. The king and the government officers should not work without consulting the people and the people and government officers should not disobey the king.

(*VI 23. p. 231*)

Therefore, the body and the soul both need strengthening. Nothing is so weakening of the body and the intellect as adultery and sexual excessiveness. The ruling class should be specially stout and healthy. If the rulers are sensual, the whole government will come to nought. It should be remembered that the subjects follow the ruler. Therefore, it is all the more necessary that the king and the government officers should never indulge in vices and should always set round examples of righteous, justice and reform before their people.

(*VI 35. p. 243*)

There should be proper method of government whether it be a subordinate kingdom or a world-wide empire. We should remember the advice given in *Yajur Veda*, chapter XVIII, verse 29, "*vayam prajāpateḥ prajā abhūma.*" i. e., we are the subjects, of God; God is our king. We are only his humble servants. May He be gracious to us and bless us with ruling power, so that we might be instrument in propagating his law.

(*VI 36. p. 244.*)

———

GOD

THE CONCEPTION OF GOD

God is endowed with all divine attributes, actions and nature. He has all knowledge. In Him subsist all luminous bodies such as the Earth and the Sun. He is all-pervading and God of all *devās*. Those who do not know Him, or have not faith in Him or do not contemplate Him are most unwise and atheistic, and are always plunged in the ocean of miseries. The realisation of God is the only means of making all men happy.

(*VII, 1. p. 245*)

THE STUPENDOUS CREATION OF GOD

Behold, how intelligent is the creation of the body? It excites the wonder of the most learned. Inside is the bony frame, with nervous ties, invested with flesh and a skin cover; then there are spleen, liver, lungs, and breathing apparatus; the lodging of the soul; organisation of brain cells, arrangement of hair and nails; very fine eye-nerves joined like telegraph wires; distinction of sense-jurisdiction, the building of different apartments in the body wherein the soul might dwell and enjoy in wakeful, dreaming and sound-slumber state, distribution of all fluids, mechanism etc.! Who can create such wonderful universe other than God? The Earth set with gems and minerals, extremely delicate organism of the seed of banayan and other trees, leaves, flowers, fruits, tubers, roots of various colours white, yellow, black and variegated; of the various tastes, sweet, saline, bitter, astingent, pungent, sour, etc; of various odours; myriad of orbs, the

sun, the moon etc. etc., the creation, sustenance, mobilization and government of so many wonder-striking objects cannot be carried on except by God. When a man sees an object then two sorts of cognitions arise in his mind, first the cognition of the nature of that object, secondly by seeing its design, the cognition of the creator. If you find an ornament in a forest, first you will see how beautiful the ornament is: then you will feel how intelligent the smith is, who has made such a pretty ornament. In the same way the various designs visible in this wonderful creation prove that there is a mighty lord who has created all this.

(*VIII, 41 pp. 312-13*)

ONENESS OF GOD

Q. Do you accept the view that the Vedas inculcate more than one God ?

A—We do not. Nowhere in the four Vedas, is there a mention of the plurality of Gods. Rather, there is a clear mention that God is one.

(*VII, 2. p. 264*)

GOD'S ATTRIBUTES

Just as God has infinite attributes, infinite functions and infinite nature, so it has infinite names, each word signifying a particular aspect.

(*I, 42, p. 39*)

Q—There is description of many '*devatās*' in the Vedas, What do you say to that ?

A.—Any thing having luminous properties is called '*deva*,' e. g. the earth. But it is nowhere regarded as God or an object of worship. This very *mantra* clears the point when it says that *all the 'devas subsist in God.'*°
They are mistaken who hold that "*deva*" and 'God' are synonyms. God is called '*Mahādeva*' or supreme *Deva*,

because He is the Lord of all *devas*, creator, sustainer and dissolver of the whole universe, the Great Judge, and the support of all. In the Vedas there is a mention of *thirty-three* devas. The Shatapatha *Brahmana* enumerates them as follows :—

(1) Eight *vasūs* or abodes of the whole creation (i. e. creatures), viz, earth, water, fire, air, ether, the moon, the sun and the stars.

(2) Eleven *Rudras* or *paingivers*. They are ten vital airs called *prāna*, *apāna*, *vyana*, *samāna*, *udāna*, *nāga*, *kūrma*, *kṛakala*, *devadutta*, *dhānañjaya* with soul the eleventh. They are called *Rudras* or *paingivers* because when they leave the body at the time of death, they make people weep.

( ) Twelve *Ādityās* or *takers*. They are twelve months of the year. They are so called because they take away the life of all.

(4) *Electricity* is called *Indra* or most powerful, and because it is the source of great power.

(5) *Yajna* is called *Prajāpati*, because it is conducive to the purity of air, rain, water, vegetation etc. to respect to the learned, and to all sorts of art and craft. The literal meaning of *prajāpati* is '*lord* of creation' as the *yajnā* sustains all, it is named as *prajāpati*. This makes the number thirty three., They are *devas* because they possess the above named properties. God is the master and most supreme of all these *devas*—the thirty fourth *deva* the worshipworthy *deva* (the *deva* whom men should worship). This has been clearly written in the fourteenth book of the Shatapatha *Brāhmaṇa* and elsewhere too. Had the objectors seen the books they should not have fallen into the error of saying that the Vedas teach polytheism.

(*VII*, 2. *p.p.* 246-247)

Q. Is God everywhere or does He reside at one place ?

A. He is everywhere. Had He been at one place only, he could not have been all-pervading. all-knowing, all

ordaining, all-creating, all-sustaining and all-dissolving No agent can work at a place where he does not exist.

(*VII*, 9, *p*. 249)

Q. Is God merciful and just both or not?

A. Yes, He is both.

Q. These two attributes are inconsistent. Where there is Justice, there is no mercy; and where there is mercy, there is no justice. Justice means the giving of exactly so much pleasure or pain as is one's due on account of one's good or bad actions; neither a jot more, nor a jot less. But mercy means to let the guilty go unpunished.

A, Justice and mercy differ only in name. They both serve the same purpose. Punishment is given for the purpose of dissuading man from sin and preventing his pain. Your interpretation of justice and mercy is not correct. Justice means that a criminal should be punished to the extent of his crime. If he is not punished, mercy is out of question. To let off one robber means to give pain to thousands of righteous people. How will it be called mercy when letting off of one man means misery to so many? To put the robber in the prison and to prevent him from further evil deeds is mercy to the robber, and to kill the robber is mercy to thousands of other men.

Q. Then why are these two words 'mercy' and 'justice'? If both mean the same what is the use of having two words? One word would have been enough. This shows that mercy and justice do not mean the same.

A. Is it not true that many words convey the same meaning and many meanings are conveyed by the same word?

Q. It is.
A. Why do you object then?

Q. Because the world says so.

A. The world says right and wrong both. It is we who should discriminate. Well, look here. The greatest

mercy of God is this, that God has created all sorts of objects in the world so that the souls may be benefited thereby. What else can be a greater mercy ? Now look at justice. It is evident by the difference in the magnitude of pleasure and pain, due to good and bad actions. The only difference between mercy and justice is of angles of vision. When one wishes that people may be happy and be exempted from pain, it is mercy. But the dealing out of punishment etc. by external actions is justice. The purpose of both these is the same, viz, prevention of sin and removal of pain.

(*VII. 10 pp. 249-250*)

Q. Has God a form or is He formless ?

A. He is formless. Had he not been all-prevading, He could not have had attributes such as Omniscience. Every finite thing has finite attributes, finite activities and finite nature. Besides a god with form (a corporeal God) could not have been free from such limitations as cold, heat, hunger, thirst, disease. impurities, piercing, cuts etc. This proves that God is formless (incorporeal). If He were to have a body then there should be some one else as the creator of His nose, ears, eyes, etc. If any body suggests that God might Himself have created His body with His own will, then, too, it supports our view, for in that case God must have been formless before the creation of the body. Therefore, God never assumes body, but in His formless condition converts the fine and invisible material of the world into a gross and visible form.

(*VII 11 pp. 250-251*)

Q. Is God all-powerful or not ?

A. He is, but not in the sense, in which you think. 'All powerful' means simply this, that he does not require the assistance of anybody else in creating, sustaining and dissolving the world and in managing the system of awarding pain and pleasure for good or bad deeds of the souls.

He accomplishes all His work through His infinite capacity.

Q. But we hold that God can do whatever He wishes There is none above him.

A. What does he wish ? If you say that He wishes everything an1 can do everything, then we ask you Can He kill himself ? Can he make an equal of himself ? Can He become ignorant ? Can he commit sins such an adultery ? Can he suffer pain ? As these things are inconsistent with his qualities, actions, and nature, similarly your statement that "He can do everything" is also in-admissible. Therefore, ours is the only correct meaning of the word "All-powerful."

(VII 12 p. 251).

Q. Does God incarnate or not ?

A. No. God is un-born as is evident from the following :—

(1) *Āja ekapat.* *(Yajur Veda. XXKIV, 53).*
God is unborn and indivisible.

(2) *Saparyagāchchhukṛam-akāyam,*
(Ibid XL. 8).
He pervades through all. He is bodiless.

Q. Yadā yadā hi dharmasya glānir bhavati Bhārata,
Ābhyut-thānam-adharmasya tad-ātmanam srjāmyaham.
(Gita IV. 7).

In this verse Lord *Kṛasṇa* says "whenever righteousness deteriorates, I take my birth."

A. Being anti-vedic, this statement is not valid. If you take it in another sense, it may be accepted. *Kṛsna* was a virtuous man and always wanted to do good to the world. He might have meant that in order to protect the righteous and destroy the wicked, he would like to be born in every age.

It is proverbial that all belongings of good men (body, mind and wealth) are meant for the benefaction of the world. Even then *Kṛsṇa* cannot be God.

Q. If so, how do people say that that there are twenty-four incarnations of God?

A. Because they do not know the Vedas, are misled by sectaries, and are themselves uneducated, therefore they believe in such superstitions and do wrong things.

Q. If God were not to come into flesh, how would He kill wicked persons like *Kansa* and *Rāvaṇa.* ?

A. First, whoever is born must die, secondly when creation, sustenance and dissolution of the whole universe are doable by God without the help of any body, *Kansa, Rāvaṇa* etc. are of no significance before Him. When He pervades all things, He pervades their bodies also and can destroy them in an instant. What other epithet than 'foolish' can be appropriately used for him who is infinite in attributes, infinite in activity and infinite in nature, but is compelled to subject Himself to birth and death in order to kill a small creature ? If any body says that He takes birth in order to emancipate those devotees, it is also wrong. God has power to emancipate those devotees who act in obedience to His injunctions. Do you think that to kill *Kansa, Rāvana* etc. or to lift up the hill named *Govardhana* are more difficult tasks than the creation, sustenance and dissolution of the earth, the Sun, the Moon and other objects ? If one looks at God's work in nature, he must admit that there is none equal to God, nor there shall ever be.

Reasoning also disproves God's incarnation. If anybody were to say that the infinite space entered the womb or somebody closed it in his fist, it would be wrong, because space being infinite and all-pervading, the use of the words 'came in' or 'went out' is meaningless in this connection. Similarly God being infinite and all-pervading it is ridiculous to say that He *goes in or comes out*. A thing goes to or comes from the place where it does not exist. Did God not exist in the womb before He came into it ? Or did He not exist outside before He came out ? who but a fool can speak or believe so in connection with God ?

God's coming or going, birth or death cannot be proved. Hence it is clear that Christ etc. cannot be God's incarnations. They were men because they had human qualities, attachment, aversion, hunger, thirst, fear, sorrow, pain, pleasure, birth, death etc.

(*VII*, *33*, *34*, *35*, *36*, *p.p.* *264-265*)

Q.—Does God forgive the sins of His devotees, or not?

A.—No. If sins were to be forgiven, His Justice would be tampered with and all men would become sinful. Mere prospects of forgiveness make man bold and courageous to commit sins. When a king pardons the failings of his men, they become bold and commit gross faults in the hope that when they would beseech him with folded hands and humble demeanour, he would forgive them. Even those who are not inclined to crimes, begin to commit them, as they have no fear. The same holds good in the case of God. Therefore, to reward virtue and punish vice in exact proportion is the work of God, not to forgive sins.

(VII *37*. *pp.* *265-266*)

The neo-vedantists who hold the identity of God and soul are ignorant of the Vedanta.

(*VII*, *48*, *p.* *272*)

Hence it is clear that the soul was never God, nor is God, nor shall ever be God. Similarly, God was never the soul, nor shall ever be the soul.

(*VII*, *54* *p.* *276*)

Q. Why do you controvert the identity of God and soul when both of them have the same qualities, i. e., existence, cognition and happiness ?

A. Partial similarity is no proof of identity. e. g., earth water and fire are all inert and visible. But they are not identical. Their peculiarities prove their distinctiveness. For instance, earth has odour, dryness, hardness, etc.,

water has taste, fluidity, softness etc., while fire has shape combustibility etc. Those different attributes prove that earth, water and fire are not the same. Men and ants see with eyes, eat with mouths, and walk with feet. But they are not the same because men have peculiar shape and two feet, while ants have a different shape and more than two feet. In the same way God's infinite knowledge, happiness, power and activities, infallibility and omnipresence differentiate Him from soul; and finite knowledge, finite power, finite magnitude, fallibility and minuteness differentiate it from God. Therefore, God and soul are not the same. Their natures are different. God is the finest and the soul grosser.

(*VII. 56 p. 277*).

Q.—Has God any form ? or is He formless ?

A.—We believe Him to be formless (incorporeal).

(VII *64. p. 282*)

Q.—Is it a duty that we should worship God ?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Will God in exchange of worship absolve the worshipper of his sins ?

A.—No.

Q.—Why worship, then?

A.—Its object is different.

Q.—What is it ?

A.—*Stuti* or appreciation creates love for God and helps a man to reform his character by contemplating the character of God.

Prārthanā or prayer creates humility, hopefulness and confidence.

Upāsanā conduces to communion with God and His realization.

(VII *15. p. 252*)

Q.—Is repetition of name altogether useless? The *Purāṇas* speak so highly of reciting name.

A.—Your method of repeating names is not right. The way in which you recite names is useless.

Q.—What is our method?

A.—It is against the Vedas.

Q.—Now please let us know what is the Veda-enjoined way of reciting name.

A.—The name should be repeated in this way. Take the word 'just' for instance. 'Just' is the name of God because He is partial to none and deals with every body with justice. Now we should also follow His example and in our wordly affairs, we should deal with everybody with fairness, without being partial to everybody. In this way the remembrance of even one name is quite sufficient to improve the condition of men.

(XI *66. p. 439-40*)

Q. We know that God is formless. But He assumes the bodies of Shiva, *Viṣṇu Gaṇeṣa. Sūrya, Devi* etc., and incarnated himself as *Rāma* and *Kṛṣna*. Therefore, we make this representation in the form of idols. Is it wrong?

A. Wrong, wrong, and wrong. The Vedas mention him as unborn (*Aja ekapāt*) and bodiless (*akāyam*) and He cannot come within the limitations of birth and death. Reasoning too is against the incarnation of God. For He who is all-pervading, infinite and free from pain, pleasure, visibility etc., cannot put himself in a very tiny drop of semen, or womb or body. Going and coming is possible in case of a localized object only, God is motionless, and invisible and there is not even a small particle where He is not. Therefore, to conceive him as incarnating is absurd as to get the son of a sterile woman married and then to see her grandson.

Q. When God is all pervading, He is in the idol also. Why is it not then proper to worship him by supposing him in any object?

1. *Na kāṣṭhe vidyate devo na pāṣāṇe na mṛṇmaye.*
Bhāve hi vidyate devas tasmād bhāvo hi kāraṇam.

God is neither in the wood, nor in the stone, nor in any earthen article, He is a thing of conception. He is realisable wherever you conceive Him.

A. When God is all pervading, then to suppose or *conceive Him in one article in exclusion* with others is just like depriving a world-emperor of his vast empire and confining him to the ownership of the small cottage. What a great disrespect! Are you not, similarly, dishonouring God by your idol-worship? When you hold Him all-pervading, why do you pluck flowers and leaves from the trees and offer them to the idol? Why do you apply sandal paste? Why do you offer incense? Why do you ring bells or play at cymbals and other musical instruments? He is in your hands; why do you fold hands before Him? He is in your head; why do you bow your head before Him? He is in the food and in the water; why do you offer these things to Him? He is in water, why do you give Him a bath? We admit that He exists in all objects. But the question is: Do you worship that which *pervades* or that which is *pervaded*? If you worship the *pervader*, then it is meaningless to offer sandal, flowers etc., to a block of wood or stone? And if you worship the *pervaded*, then why do you speak the false-hood that you are worshipping God? Why do you not tell the truth that you are worshippers of stones etc.

Now take the question of supposition. Is supposition true or false? If true then God will be in the bondage of your supposition. Why do you not suppose the existence of gold, silver etc., in a clod of earth, of diamond or sapphire in a stone, of pearls in the sea-froth; of butter, milk, curd etc., in water, of flour, or sugar in dust? And why do you not derive the same advantage from them? You never suppose the existence of pain, then why do you get it? You always think of pleasure. Why do you not get it? Why cannot a blind man see by supposing that

he has eyes ? You never think of death; why do you die ? Therefore, your theory of supposition is quite wrong. The true conception is the conception of a thing as it actually is. To think fire as fire and water as water is true conception. To think fire as water or water as fire is wrong conception or mis-conception. To think a thing as it is, is knowledge. To think it otherwise is ignorance. Therefore, you are calling conception as mis-conception and mis-conception as conception.

Q. Well, sir, the deity does not come into the idol, so long as we do not invoke it by the recitation of the Vedic verses. When we invite it, it comes; when we dismiss it, it goes away.

A. If invocation brings the deity to the idol, why does not the idol become conscious ? And why does it not go away, when you bid good-bye to it ? Where does it come from ? And where does it go to ? You simpletons, hearken. The pefect God neither goes anywhere nor comes from anywhere. If by the force of your vedic verses, you can invite the deity to the idol, why do you not invite, by the same Vedic verses, the spirit of your dead son into his body ? And (if dismissal by the recitation of Vedic verses is possible, then) why do you not kill your enemy by dismissing his soul out of his body ? Look here, my simple friends ! These Popes fill their pockets by playing fraud upon you. In the Vedas, there is not even a word to sanction idol-worship, or invoking invitations and dismissals.

(*XI.* 67, 68, 69. 70 *pp.* 440–442).

Should theft, fornication, lying and other such evil things be also begun with the name of God ? It is verily for this that the butchers and other Moslems recite this verse "Bismillāh" (i. e. with the name of God etc.) in slaughtering cows and other animals. If this is the interpretation, then evil deeds are also preluded by the Moslems with the name of God.

(*XIV.* 1 *page.* 763).

Fight in the path of God against those who fight against you.

Kill them wherever get hold of them. Nuisance is severer than slaughter.

Fight till there is left no nuisance and the religion of Allah prevails.

To what extent they have been aggressors against you to that extent ye be against them.

M. 1, si. 2, Su. 2, V. 190, 191, 193, 194)

Comment. Had there been no such things in the Quoran, the Moslem would never have done the gross ill treatment which they have so far done with the followers of other faiths. They have to their charge the greatest sin of killing innocent people The non acceptance of Moslem's religion they call heresy and they hold slaughter superior to heresy; i. e., they say that they will put to death those persons who do not accept Islam. This they have been all along doing and fighting for religion, they have lost all their kingdom etc. Their religion is very hard on the followers of other religions. Is theft a return for theft ? To what extent thieves and the like sin against us, should we also sin against them to the same extent ? These things are very unjust. If any ignorant man abuses us, shall we also abuse him in return ?

(XIV. 35. p. 780).

—:o:—

TRANSMIGRATION OF SOUL

Q. Is there one birth (life or many ?

A. Many.

Q. If there are many births then why does a man not remember his previous life and death.

A. The knowledge of the soul is limited. It is not the seer of three times (past, present and future). Therefore, it can not recall the past experiences. Besides the mind with which a man thinks cannot hold more than one awareness at the same time. (There is only one thing present in the consicousness at one time), Let alone the experiences of the past life, why does a man not remember the events of this very life—his coming into the womb, the development of the body, his birth and myriads of events before the age of five ? After experiencing several events in the wakeful and dreaming states, when the soul enters sound sleep, why does it not recall the events of those past states ? If you are asked what you were doing twelve years ago, in the fifth month of the thirteenth year, 9th day at 10 o'clock, in what position and in what direction were your mouth, hands, ears, eyes and body, and what ideas were there in your mind you will not be able to answer. When in this very body this oblivion takes place, then your objection on the ground of non-rememberance of the previous life is simply puerile. It is a matter of consolation that a man does not remember his past life, otherwise the painful memory of past sorrows

would have put an end to his life. If a man wants to know his past or future life he can not because the knowledge and nature of the soul are finite. This thing is knowable to God and not to the soul.

(IX. 49, p. 348).

P. Are the same souls in human and animal bodies alike? Or do they belong to different species?

A. The souls are the same. But they are pure or impure according to their good or bad deeds.

Q. Does the soul of a man pass into the body of an animal and that of animal in the body of man? Similarly, does the soul of a female go into the body of a male and that of a male into the body of a female?

A. Yes, it does. When vices wax and virtues wane, then the soul of a man assumes a lowlier body of lower animals. When virtues predominate over vices, then the soul takes up a nobler body, i. e., of a learned man. When vice and virtue are equal, the soul is born as an ordinary man. Even in human lives, there are gradations, high grade, intermediate grade and low grade, according to the nature of actions. When the punishment for excessive sins has been suffered in animal lives, the soul comes back to the life of an average man. When the soul leaves the body, it is death; when it again takes the body it is birth.

(IX. 57, 58 p. 353)

Q. What is emancipation?

A. Emancipation means '*release*'

Q. Release from what?

A. That from which all souls wish to be released.

Q. From which do they wish to be released?

A. That which they need to be released from.

Q. What do they need to be released from?

A. From pain.

Q. After being released from pain, what do they get and where do they live ?

A. They get happiness and live in God.

Q. What causes emancipation and what bondage ?

A. Emancipation is the result of the following :—

(i) Obedience to the order of God.

(ii) Avoidance of vices, ignorance, bad company, ill associations, and evil habits.

(iii) Truth-fulness, benefaction, education, impartial justice, promotion of righteousness.

(iv) God's worship (appreciation, prayer and realisation) according to the methods dealt with above, practice of *yoga*, study, increase of knowledge by legitimate efforts,

(v) Utilization of the most excellent means.

(vi) Doing everything that is to be done in an impartial, just and righteous manner etc. etc.

A conduct contrary to that delineated above and disobedince to God's order contribute towards bondage.

Q. Does the merging of the soul take place in emancipation ? Or does the soul remain distinctly existent ?

A. It remains existent.

Q. Where does it dwell ?

A. In God.

Q. Where is God ? Does the emancipated soul remain at one place or does it stroll about freely every-where ?

A. God is every-where in a perfect condition. The emancipated soul strolls freely in knowledge, happiness, and independence. There is nothing to thwart its movements.

Q. Does the emancipated soul possess corporeal body ?

A. No.

Q. Then how does it enjoy pleasure and happiness?

A. It maintains in fact all its natural attributes and natural capabilities such as true conception etc. Only corporeal associations cease.

(*IX, 13, 14, 15, 16 pp. 332-33*)

Q. After attaining salvation does the soul come again into the tribulation of birth and death? or not? Salvation is that emancipation from which there is no coming-back into the world.

A. It is not correct. The Vedas contradict this view.

Just as now there are bondaged and emancipated souls, so they always remain. There is no absolute annihilation of either bondage or of salvation. But bondage and emancipation are not everlasting.

(*IX 22 23 pp. 336, 337*).

The beginninglessness of the souls is all right, but it is a mistake to hold that the finite and fallible souls become infinite and infallible in salvation. A finite and fallible being will always remain finite and shall always have limitations of knowledge. The Jaina *Tīrthaṅkaras* are mistaken in holding that the world, the souls, the actions of the souls and bondage are beginningless The causes and effects of this composed world cannot be beginningless nor particular effects can be cyclically beginningless, nor the actions of the soul, or its bondage. If you believe (the actions and bondage) to be beginningless, then why do you believe that there can be release from the actions and the bondage?

That which is beginningless can never terminate If you will hold that beginningless things can also come to a termination, then there will be a question as to why your all beginningless things should also not perish. You believe

in the eternality and beginninglessness of things, then the actions and the bondage both will be eternal. If you believe that salvation is the result of release from actions, then "release from actions" is the means of salvation. Now such a salvation is not permanent (because it is the result of something) and will not last for ever. (This is one flaw). The actor and the action are related inseparably. Then it is wrong to believe that there can be release from action. Thus your theory that your salvation and the salvation of your *Tīrthaṅkaras* is permanent, cannot stand.

Q. Just as a huskless, or parched grain of rice cannot germinate, similarly the soul which has got its salvation does not again come to the world of births and deaths.

A. The relation of soul and action is not the same as that of the grain and the husk. The soul, its actions and its capacity to produce action are inseparably related from eternity. If you believe that the soul has no inherent capacity to act, then the soul will be inert like a block of stone and will not have the fitness of enjoying the happiness of salvation. If the soul can attain salvation by terminating the eternally inseparable bondage of action then your eternal salvation can also come to a break and be followed by bondage. Just as you believe that a soul can attain salvation by being released from the actions which are the means of salvation, similarly the soul can also get a release from the permanent salvation and fall into bondage again. That which is got by some means can never be eternal. But if you believe that salvation can be acquired without any means (actions), then bondage can be acquired without any actions. Just as the contact of dirt makes clothes dirty and dirt is removed by washing them in water, and another contact with dirt can again make the same clothes dirty, similarly the soul being subject to attachment and aversion, falsehood and other such evils entagle it into the fruit of actions; and true knowledge and thoughtful living make the soul pure.

If you admit that the soul's impurity is due to its contact with dirt, then you cannot escape the conclusion

that the wordly soul can secure emancipation and the emancipated soul can again come into the world (and become worldly). If some causes can rem ve dirt, other causes can contract it also. Therefore, accept the bondage and salvation of the soul as cyclically eternal and not as having no beginning and no end.

(XII-36, 37 p, 629–630)

—:o:—

THREE ETERNALS AND THE UNIVERSE

Q. Does this universe originate from God or from anything else ?

A. Its agental cause is God, but its *material* cause is Prakṛati (materia radica).

Q. Did not God create the Prakṛti ?

A, No. It is beginningless.

Q. What is the meaning of the word 'beginning' and how many things are beginningless ?

A. God, soul and material cause (materia radica) of the universe are beginningless.

(*VIII 3, 4, p. 290–291*)

Q. How many are the causes of the world ?

A. Three, one *agental* cause. second *material* cause and third *auxiliary* cause.

Agental *cause* is that by whom the thing is made and without whose agency the thing cannot come into being. The agental cause does not convert himself into that being. He simply changes one thing into the form of another.

The material cause is that without which the thing can not be made, which itself is transformed into that thing and is again dissolved also.

The *auxiliary cause* is that which is instrumental or an ordinary help in the formation of the thing.

The agental cause is of two kinds :—

The chief agental cause is God who makes the universe out of the materia-radica, sustains and dissolves it and governs everything. Then there is another *agental cause* the soul which is an agent in an ordinary sense. It takes the articles out of God's creations and fashions them into different forms. The materia-radica consists of atoms or material for the creation of the world. This cannot make or unmake itself because it is not sentient. It is made if some one makes it and is unmade if some one unmakes it. Some times an insentient effect is (appears to be) made or unmade by an insentient cause, e. g., God-made seed if thrown in the soil and watered, germinates and grows into a tree, and is burnt into ashes if brought into contact with fire. But the organised creation or dissoluion of these things depends upon God and souls. When a thing is made, it requires knowledge, insight, power, hand and other tools, time, space, etc., as auxiliary causes, e.g., if a pot has to be made, it needs the agental cause potter, material cause clay, and auxiliary causes, wheel, space, time, light, eyes, hands, knowledge and activity. Without these three causes nothing can be made or unmade.

(*VIII, 11, pp. 295-96*).

Q. Has this universe any beginning or not ?

A. No. Just as night precedes day and day precedes night, or day follows night and night follows day, just so dissolution precedes creation and creation precedes dissolution, or dissolution follows creation and creation follows dissolution. This cycle has been going on from eternity. It has neither beginning nor end. But as you see the beginning and end both, of every day and every night, similary every creation and every dissolution has it beginning and its end. God, soul and materia-radica, these three are eternal by themselves (i. e., individually). But the creation and life of the universe are cyclically eternal. By cyclic eternity, we mean stream-like continuity. The

stream of a river is ever continuous. It may dry up in the summer but in rainy season it again begins flowing. Just as attributes, activities and nature of God are beginningless, so are the creation, sustenance and dissolution of this world. Just as there is no beginning or end of God's attributes, activites and nature, similarly there is no beginning or end of the actions, which of necessity, emanate from him.

(*VIII 45 p. 314*).

Q. How long has it been since the creation of the world ?

A. Since the creation of the world and the revelation of the Vedas have elapsed one billion, ninty-six karoras, several lacs and several thousand years. I have explained it elaborately in my book "Introduction to the commentary of the Rg. Veda".

(*VIII 52 p. 318*).

—:o:—

THE VEDAS

The scriptures are of two kinds :—

(I) Of supreme authority (*svataḥ pramāṇa*). The four Vedas come under this head. They being the word of God are free from all blemishes and are an authority by themselves.

(2) Of subordinate authority (*parataḥ pramāṇa*). The Brāhmaṇas and all other books come under this head. They are an authority only so far as they are consistent with the Vedas.

(*III. 91. pp. 105 106*).

Q. What is your religion ?

A. Our religion is Vedic; i. e., we accept and reject those things which are respectively acceptable and rejectable according to the Vedas. We believe in the Vedas. All persons should believe so and the Aryas in particular, should profess no other faith than this and live harmoniously.

(*III. 95 p. 107*).

Q If He is formless, how would He pronounce the Vedic words without his mouth ? The pronunciation of letters needs palate and other parts of mouth, as well as the force exercised by the tongue.

A—Being all powerful and pervasive God does not need mouth etc. for the revelation of Vedic science. The

use of the mouth or the tongue is needed only in pronouncing words to those who are remote from us, not for ourselves. Even without the use of the mouth and the tongue various thoughts and sounds remain current in the mind. Close you ears with your fingers and hear how many sounds are audible without the use of the mouth and the tongue. In the same way has God, who is within the souls, revealed His teachings to them. Pronounciation is necessary only when we make *others* hear the words. God being formless (incorporeal) and all pervasive reveals all vedic science to the souls from within. It is after this revelation that men teach the vedas to others through word of mouth. This difficulty cannot arise in the case of God.

Q. In whose mind and when were the Vedas revealed ?

A.

Agner ṛgvedo vāyor Yajurvedaḥ Sūryād Sāmavedaḥ.

(*Shatapatha XI*. 4, 2, 3)

In the beginning of creation God revealed to the hearts of Agni, Vāyu, Āditya and Aṅgirā one Veda each.

(*VII 65, 66 p*. 282)

Q.—Which books are called the Vedas ?

A.—The *ṛk*, the *Yaju*, the *Sāma*, the *Atharva* only the mantra portion (collection of the mantras).

(*VII. 72. p. 285*)

The *ṛṣis* have composed books on grammar, philology, prosody etc. after having read the Vedas. If God had not revealed the Vedas, no body could have composed anything. Therefore, the Vedas are the books of God. All persons should act according to their injunctions. If any body asks them what religion they belong to, they should say their religion is Vedic.

(*VII. 76. p. 288*)

—:o:—

HOMA

Q.—What benefit accrues from the performance of *homa* (fumigation rite)?

A.—All persons know that impure air and impure water cause diseases and diseases give pain to the creatures, while scented air and water are conducive to health and annihilation of diseases, and ensures happiness.

Q.—Application of sandal paste or eating of clarified butter and other things is very beneficial. It is no action of wise men to lose these things for nothing by consigning them to fire.

A.—You would never have said such things had you been conversant with the science of matter. No substance can perish in its entirety. Behold, wherever *homa* is performed, its good smell reaches the nose of a person standing at a place remote from it. So is the case with a bad smell. Just calculate thereby that a substance burnt in fire is rarefied and expands with the air and removes the impurities of a distant place.

Q.—If this is the object, then it can be served by keeping in the house safforn, musk, flowers and other scents. They will make the air well-scented and will do good to the occupants.

A.—That scent has not the power to turn out the air of the house and replace it by purer air, as it does not possess power to rarefy. It is only fire that has the power of decomposing impure substance, and after rarefying the

air throwing them out and drawing in pure air in its place.

Q.—Then what is the object of reciting *mantras* in the performance of *homa.*

A.—The *mantras* explain the uses of *homa.* Their recitation keeps them fresh in the memory. It helps the study of the Vedas and their preservation.

Q.—Is it a sin not to perform this *homa* ?

A.—Yes. Because to what extent impurities come out of a man's body, pollute air and water, and causing diseases do injury to other beings, to that extent he is committing a sin. In atonement for this, he should contribute so much or even more towards the purification of air and water. If these things are given to a man for eating and drinking, it will do good only to one individual. The amount of clarified butter and aromatic substance which a single individual can make use of is sufficient to do good to thousands of persons through the instrumentality of *homa.* But if men do not eat wholesome substances such as clarified butter, their body and mind can not be developed. Therefore, they should by all means eat such things. But at the same time, *homa* too should be performed. It is very essential indeed.

Q.—How many offerings should each man give and in what quantity ?

A. Every man should offer at least sixteen offerings and each offering should contain at least six *māshās* (about 1½ drachm) of clarified butter and other substances. If more still better. It is why the great *āryas* of the yore, saints, sages, kings, emperors and others performed and caused to be performed big *homas.* So long as the practice of *homa*-performance was in vogue, this country of the *Aryāvarta* remained free from diseases, and happy; and it can again be equally so if the same practice is resumed.

(*III.* 20, 21, 22 *pp.* 64–66).

Svāmi Dayānanda believes that horse-sacrifice and cow-sacrifice as generally attributed to Hinduism are anti-vedic and is an interpolation into vedic literature by the opponents of the Vedic religion. He writes :—

They made the several books in the name of sages and introduced sacrifices called *Gomedha* (cow-sacrifice) and *Ashvamedha* (horse-sacrifice). They said that if cows and horses are killed and offered in a sacrifice, the sacrificer and the animal both would go to heaven. The reality is that the words *Ashvamedha, Gomedha, and Naramedha* are found in the Brāhmaṇas, but they have been misinterpreted there.

Q.—What is the true meaning of Ashvamedha, Gomedha and Naramedha ?

A.—These words mean :—

Rāṣṭram va ashvamedhaḥ.

(*Shata. 13-I-6-3*).

Annagvam hi gauḥ.

(*Shata. 4-3-1-25*).

Agnirvā ashvaḥ. Ājyam medhaḥ.

(*Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa*).

Nowhere is there an injunction to kill a horse, a cow or a man and to offer the flesh in the *homa*, except in the books of the vāmamārgists. It is the vāmamārgists who have given currency to these practices. And wherever in the Vedic books there is mention of them, they are the interpolations effected by these vāmamārgists. In the above quotations '*Rāṣṭram vā avhvamedhaḥ*', *ashvamedha* is the name of good and just government of the people by the king. He who promulgates education is the sacrificer (*yajamāna*),, '*Agnir vā ashvaḥ* the word *ashva* means fire. Ājyam medhaḥ, i. e., the word 'medha' stands for clarified butter. Therefore '*ashvamedha*' also means to offer butter in the fire in Homa (fumigation ceremony). "*Annam hi gauḥ*" 'gauh' means food. Besides, this word is used

for senses, sunrays, earth etc., therefore by 'Gomedha' is meant the purification of food, senses, earth etc., When the man dies, then cremation of his dead body according to Vedic injunctions is called nara-medha.

Q.—The priests say that the sacrificer and the animal both go to the heaven. It is also said that the sacrificed animal was again restored to life. Is it correct ?

A.—No. If it were true that the sacrificer and the animal go to , heaven, then the priest who says so should be sacrificed and sent to heaven. Why do you not, in this way, send to heaven his dear mother, father, wife, son etc., by first slaughteripg them and then offering their flesh to the fire ? And why are they not restored to life from the altar ?

(XI. 25, 26, p.p. 403-404)

—:o:—

वैदिक पुस्तकालय मुरादाबाद

सम्पर्क - 9029421718

FLESH AND WINE

They should shun the use of *flesh*, wine etc.

(*II 19. p. 53*)

Male and female students should avoid wine, *flesh*, scents..........

. (*III. 42. p. 76*)

As to *flesh-eating*, it is forbidden in all periods and at all times.

(*IV. 96, p. 177*).

Avoiding *flesh*, liquor etc. .... sanyasin should travel in the world, with the object of raising the level of learning and conduct.

(*V. 16, p. 187*).

Just as a lion, or other *flesh-eating beasts* kill and devour fat and well-grown animals, similarly an absolute monarch destroys the state.

(*VI. 3 p. 199*).

Those who eat *flesh* and drink wine have their bodies, virile fluid and other bodily elements corrupted.

(*X, 8-p. 371*).

In no circumstances whatsoever should they take *flesh* and wine.

(*X. 9 p. 371*)

We admit that dining with flesh-eaters and wine-drinkers such as Moslems and Christians produces among āryas also the *evil habits of flesh eating and drinking.*

(*X. 14. p. 375*)

The articles harmful to intellect should never be used, nor foods rotten, decomposed, producing bad smell, ill-cooked or cooked by flesh-eaters whose bodies are permeated with particles of meat and liquor. Such foods are also to be avoided which can be got by killing useful animals.

(*X. 17 p- 376*).

For example, neither we should kill, nor let kill animals like cow who in one generation does good to four hundred seventy-five thousand, and six hundred men Suppose one cow yields twenty seers of milk daily and another two seers, then the daily average comes to eleven seers. Some cows give milk for eighteen months and others for six months, thus the average comes to twelve months. In this way one cow with her milk of one life can satisfy 24960 men at one time. A cow gives six she-calves and six he-calves. Suppose two of them die. Then remain ten. Five she-calves give in their life time sufficient milk to satisfy 124800 men at one time. Now are left five oxen. They can produce in their life-time at least 5000 maunds of corn, which at the rate of three-quarters of a seer per head suffices for a quarter of a million people. Milk and corn put together suffice for 374800 individuals. Add both and it comes to 475600 men satisfied at one time by one cow in one generation. If succeeding generations are also taken into calculation it comes to a very huge figure. Moreover, oxen are very useful to men for

transport purposes of various type. The milk of cow is of special nutritive value. Buffaloes too are equally useful. But cow milk is far more useful for brain than buffaloe milk. It is why Aryas have held the cows most valuable. So will others do if they are wise. A goat satisfies 2920 individuals in her life time. Elephants, horses, camels, sheep, asses are also very serviceable. Those who kill these animals should be considered guilty of so many men's murder. During the rule of Aryas, no slaughter was allowed of cows or other serviceable animals. Then men and other creatures lived happily in the *Āryāvartta* and other countries of the world. Milk, butter, oxen and other animals were in abundance and supply of food articles was up to the mark. From the time the flesh-eating foreigners have come to India and begun slaughtering cows etc., and the rule has passed to to wine drinking officials, the miseries of the Āryas are gradually increasing. For *Naṣṭemūle naiva phalam na puṣpam (Vṛddha Chāṇakya X-13).* When the root of the tree is cut off, flowers and fruits cannot be obtained.

Q. If all become non-violent, lions etc. will multiply so much that they would devour cows and other animals and your efforts would be set at naught.

A. It is the duty of the Government to punish the offending animals and men and even to kill them.

(*X 18. pp. 377–78*).

Then they say that there is no sin in eating flesh used as an offering in the performance of a sacrifice. These are all rougish practices introduced by the vāmamārgists. They say that the violence allowed in the performance of a Vedic ritual does not amount to a criminal violence. We ask them what sin it would be if they or their relations are killed and offered in the sacrifice. It is silly to say that there is no sin in eating flesh, drinking wine or indulging in sexual pleasure. Without giving injury to an

animal, no flesh is to be obtained and to give injury to any one without his fault is a sin. Drinking is decidedly a bad thing and no where is it permitted except in the scriptures of the vāmamārgists. Sexual intercourse without matrimonial rights is sinful and he who advocates it is wrong.

(*XI. 24. pp. 402–403*).

—:o:—

SANYASA

The order in which āshramas (or four stages) of a man's life should be followed is this :—first a man should finish his Brahmacharya life (student life with celebacy or strict sex purity). then he should enter Gṛahasth (married life); then he should be Vānaprastha or recluse (go to a forest to practise austerities), in the end he should be a *Sanyāsin* or Renuncient (i. e he should renounce the world and devote himself solely to the work of preaching religion and piety to the public).

(*V. I. p. 179*).

Q. Is *Sanyāsa* among the duties of a *Brāhmaṇa* only, or of *kṣattriyas* and other ?

A. Only a *Brāhmana* is authorised to be a *sanyāsin.* Any man who is thoroughly learned, righteous and philanthropic is a *Brāhmaṇa,* from whatever class he might have come. There is no special good for the world in a sanyāsa without thorough education, piety, faith in God or renunciation. It is, therefore, proverbial that only a *Brāhmaṇa* is authorised to embrace sanyās and not other's.

(*V. 19. p. 190*).

Q. *Sanyāsins* say that they have no duties to perform.

They receive food and clothes from others and live a life of ease. Why should they worry their brains about the world which is due to nescience, i. e., is unreal ? They should regard their self as God. If anybody comes to them they should tell him the same thing, i. e., "Thou too, art God, no virtue or sin attaches to thee. Heat and cold belong to the body, hunger and thirst to vital airs, joys and sorrows to the mind. The world is unreal. So are all affairs of the world—unreal and imaginary. Therefore, it is not the business of the wise to be engrossed in this world. Whatever evil or good there is, it is all a function of the senses, not of the soul." Such are the teachings of of the *sanyāsins*, while you assign quite different duties to the *sanyāsins*. Which should be held as true and which as untrue ?

A. Is it not their duty even to do good actions? *Manu* clearly says that all *sanyāsins* must do Veda-enjoined good deeds. Shall they be ever able to abandon actions of eating and dressing ? And if they connot give up such actions, then how are they not fallen and sinful by quitting good actions ? When they accept food, dress etc. from the house-holders and give them nothing in return, then are they not committing the great sin of ingratitude ? Just as eyes and ears are useless if the work of seing and hearing is not taken from them, similarly if *sanyāsins* do not devote themselves to the study and propagation of the Vedic teachings, they are a useless burden to the world. Those who preach that it is not worth while to worry our brains about the false world, are themselves false and propagators of sin. Whatever action is done with the body is entirely of the soul and it is the soul that enjoys the fruit. Those who say that the soul is God are in the slumber of ignorance. The soul is finite and its knowledge is also finite. God is infinite and all-knowing. God is eternal, pure, wise and free-natured. The soul is sometimes bound

and sometimes free. God being all-pervading and all-knowing, can never be susceptible to misapprehension or ignorance. The soul has sometimes knowledge and sometimes ignorance. God never suffers the pain of birth and death. The soul does. For these reasons their teachings are wrong.

(V. 21. pp. 192–193).

—:o:—

BUREAL OF THE DEAD

The burlal of the dead is very harmful to the world, as dead bodies rot, vitiate the air and cause diseases.

Q. Look here. It is not good thing to burn a man whom we love. Burying is only equal to laying a man to sleep. Therefore, burial is good.

A. When you love the corpse, why do you not keep it in your house ? The soul whom you loves has passed away. To love the putrefying body is meaningless. If you love it, why do you bury it in the ground ? If you say to any man that you will bury him, will he be pleased with you ? Is it a mark of love that you throw on its mouth, eyes, body, dust, stones, bricks, lime etc. put a stone on the breast. To put the corpse into a box and bury it, produces a very offensive smell which makes the air impure and gives rise to diverse diseases.

Secondly the burial of one dead body requires at least 6 cubits long and 4 cubits broad piece of ground. Now calculate what a great waste of land it is to bury a hundred, a thousand, a hundred thousand or ten millions of dead bodies. You can not use it as a farm, as garden or a dwelling place. Therefore, burial is the worst way of disposing the dead. A slightly less obnoxious is to throw it into the water, as watery animals atonce devour it. But whatever bones or, other stuff remains is sure to cause harm to the world.

Next is to throw it into jungles as carnivorous beasts and birds atonce pounce upon it and eat it up. But bones marrow etc. remain. They rot, pollute the air and injure public health. But burning is the best as it reduces the body into very very fine particles and spreads them in the atmosphere.

Q. Burning too spreads bad smell.

A. It does, it cremation is done unmethodically, but that too much less than burial. There will be no bad smell at all if the body is cremated according to Vedic rites, e. g. first make an altar in the ground, three cubits deep, three and a half cubits broad and five cubits long, one and a half cubits square at the bottom and rising gradually upwards. Take clarified butter in weight equal to the corpse and put in it one *ratti* per seer musk and one masha saffran, take half a maund sandal wood or even more (not less), and *agar*, *tagar*, camphor etc. Now arrange on the altar *palasha* wood and put the corpse over it. Then again put wood over the body as well a cubit all round. Now give offerings of clarified butter and burn the corpse slowly. In this way there will be no bad smell at all. This is called *antyeṣṭy nara-medha*, or *puruṣa-medha*.* Even a poor man's body should require not less than twenty seers of clarified butter. It should be provided either by the community or by the state. But cremation should be done methodically. If butter etc, are not available at all burning with fuel will do, as it will be better than burial. Besides a *biswa* of land (1/20 of a bigha or 1/32 of an acre) or even one altar is sufficient to burn millions of the dead. There is no waste of much land. Besides tombs present a horrible sight. Therefore, burial is a very objectionable method.

(*XIII. 21. p, p. 705-707*)

---

* Naramedha and Pursusa-medha have often been mistranslated as human-Sacrifice. Sacrifice it, no doubt, is, but not of a living body slaughtered. (Tr.)

BELIEFS OF SVAMI DAYANANDA

Svāmi Dayānanda sets quite new values to old terms. A glimpse at the following defintions and interpretations which he has given under the head "Beliefs" will convince the reader of the revolutionizing character of his religious and sociological notions.

1. *God.* His names are *Brahma*, *Paramātmā* etc. Existence, consciousness and bliss are His characteristics. His attributes, activities and nature are holy. He is omniscient, incorporeal, all-pervading, uncreated, infinite, omnipotent, merciful, just, creator, maintainer and dissolver of the whole universe, the fruit-giver of the actions of all the souls with strict justice. This is my conception of God.

2. *The Four Vedas.* (Full of knowledge and virtue. God-revealed. *Samhitā*, *i e.*, only the mantra-portion). I regard them infallible and of primarv authority. They are authority in themselves and do not depend upon other books for their authoritativeness. Just as the sun or a lamp is self-luminous as well as the light-giver of the earth etc., so are the four Vedas.

The *Brāhmaṅas* of the four Vedas, six *aṅgas* (limbs), six *upāṅgas* (bye-limbs), four *upavedas* (auxiliary Vedas), and 1127 Vedic branches (off-shoots) are the lectures or compositions of the sages such as *Brahmā*, on the basis of the teachings of the Vedas. I look upon them as secondary authority. That is, they are reliable only so

far as they are consistent with the Vedas. I do not accept the authority of any passage in them which might be against the Vedas.

3. Righteousness (*Dharma*) is the name of unprejudiced, just way of living, (*e. g.*, truthfulness), which might not be against the order of God and the Vedas. Similarly unrighteousness (*adharma*) is prejudiced aud uujust way of living (*e. g.*, falsehood), disobedience of God and insurgence against the Vedas.

4. The soul is a finite and eternal entity (uncreated and immortal) whose attributes are desire, aversion, pleasure, knowledge (consciousness) etc.

5. The soul and God are *distinct* in their nature and characteristics. But they are one through the relation of pervasion and similarity. Just as corporeal substance was never separable, nor is separable, nor shall be ever separable from ether ; and yet it never was, nor is, nor shall be identical with it ; similarly God is the pervader, the soul the pervaded; God the worshipable, the soul the worshipper : God the Father, the soul the son etc., etc.*

6. There are three beginningless (uncreated) categories God, the souls and materia radica (or the root-cause of the universe). They are three eternals. The attributes, functions and nature of the eternals are also eternal.

7. *Cyclic Eternality*. The substance, quality or action produced by conjunction cease to exist after disjunction. But the potentiality of the objects which brought about this conjunction is eternally inherent in them. It

* Svami Dayananda is against the doctrine that the soul is identical with Brahma or can attain to Brahma-hood after salvation The soul was never God, nor can it ever be God. The soul is the worshipper and God the objects of worship. The soul is the son and God the Father. Distinct and yet related and inseparable—this is S D's conception of the soul and God. He is against Shankaracharya's doctrine of the identity of the soul and God, as well as against Ramanuja's doctrine that the soul is only a mode of God. (Tr.)

means that they will again conjoin and disjoin. I believe in cyclic eternality of these.

8. *"Creation"* means the organised conjunction of separate substances into various forms.

9. *'The purpose of creation'* is the realisation of God's creative attributes, functions and nature. Suppose one asks, "what is the eye for ?" The answer is, "For seeing" Similarly God's creative power finds its fulfilment in the creation of the universe. The enjoyment of the fruits of the actions of the souls is also its object.*

10. The universe has a creator, The creator is the above-described God. It is quite evident from the design of the creation. The inert substances have no power to come intelligently together and produce desired substance such as seed etc. This shows that there must be some creator of the universe.

11. 'Bondage' is due to some cause. That is, ignorance has some cause. Sinful actions, worship of objects other than God, ignorance etc., etc., are the things which are productive of pain. They are called 'bondage' because we have to suffer against our will.

12. *Emancipation* is the release from all sorts of pain, an unrestricted movement in all-pervading God and His universe. The enjoyment of the bliss of salvation is limited to a fixed period of time. The released soul has again to come into the universe at the expiry of that period.†

---

* Svami Dayananda here meets two objections :—
(1) Why does God bother with the creation of the world ?
(2) What is the good of creating the world ? (Tr.)

† Swami Dayananda does not agree with the teachers of other religions who say that once released is for ever released. His motto is that what begins must come to an end. Only beginningless things are endless. There is no such thing as one-banked-river. The salvation begins. Therefore, it must end too. (Tr.)

13. *The means of salvation* are God's communion, *i. e.*, practice of yoga, righteous living, acquisition of knowledge with *Brahmacharya* (sexual purity); the association with men of learning, true knowledge, right thinking, and labour.

14. '*Artha*' (prosperity) is that which is acquired by righteousness. That which is got by evil ways is '*anartha*' (undesirable).

15. *Kāma* (happiness) is a production of righteousness and prosperity.

16. I believe in the *varṇas* and *āshramas* (four classes of the human society and four stages of a man's life) on the basis of the capacity to acquire certain qualifications and to perform certain actions.

17. The *Rājā* (literally the shining one) or king is he who shines by virtue of his noble qualities, noble actions and noble disposition, who administers justice without any prejudice, who treats the subjects like a father, and who is ever engaged in the effort to improve the condition and increase the happiness of the people, as a fatber does of his children.

18. The *Prajā* (or subjects) is that populace which equips itself with noble qualifications, noble actions and noble temperaments; which follows the just rules of conduct without any prejudice, which looks to the welfare of the king and the country, which is free from rebellious tendencies and looks upon the ruler as the son on his father.

19. He is a "*Judge*" who after due thinking abandons the untruth and embraces the truth, who suppresses the unjust, and upholds, the just; and who aims at the welfare of all as of his own. This is my conception of a "Judge" (or administerer of Justice).*

* I have translated, the word 'Nyayakari' as 'Judge' and not 'Just', as to me it appears that the author had in mind the person who

20. I understand by the term *'deva'*, men of learning; by *'asura'* the uneducated; by *'rākṣasa'* the sinners; and by *'pishācha'* the unclean.*

21. *"Deva-pūjā"* is according to my beliefs the reverence shown to men of learning, mother, father, preceptor guest, just ruler, virtuous people, a wife loyal to her husband, and a husband true to his wife. Anything contrary to this is the worship of anti-gods. The person of the aforesaid is worthy of homage (reverence) and the insentient idols are altogether unworthy of worship.†

22. *'Instruction'* is that which is conducive to learning, civility, righteousness, and sense-control and which frees men from the blemish of ignorance etc.

23. *The purāṇas.* The books called *Brāhmaṇas* such as *Aitreya* etc., which are composed by *Brahmā* etc. I call, *Purāns* (ancient lores), *Itihāsa* (tradition), *Kalpa* (ceremonials), *gāthā* (history), *Nārāshānsī* (biographical treaties). I do not consider the *Bhāgavata* (and other so called 18 *Purāṇas*) as true *Purāṇas.*

24. *"Tīrth"* (literally *ford*) is that which helps in crossing the ocean of misery. It consists of all good actions such as truthfulness, learning, good company, the practice of the eight stages of yoga such as yama, diligence, promulgation of education etc. I do not look upon pieces of water or places of pligrimage as *tīrthas.*‡

---

administers justice. Item No. 17 is the 'ruler'. Item No. 18 is 'the ruled'. Therefore item No. 19 is obviously the Judge. (Tr.)

* It refutes the commonplace belief that the devas (gods), the asuras (anti-gods), the raksasas (demons) and the pishachas (genii) are super-human beings. (Tr.)

† Condemns idolatory of all types and holds noble men superior to idols. (Tr.)

‡ It refutes the belief that visits paid to sacred places such as Jagannatha Puri or bath in sacred rivers or tanks, e. g., the Ganges or Pushkara are means of salvation. Moral life, and not rituals or superstitions, is the means of salvation. It upholds the sovereignty of moral living over meaningless conventions. (Tr.)

25. 'Effort' is superior to destiny (or fate) because it is effort that determines destiny. An effort well-made leads to success and lack of effort spoils every thing. Therefore, effort is snperior to destiny.*

26. I regard that 'man' as excellent who treats all persons like his own self at the time of happiness, sorrow, loss or profit according to their rank and position. Contrary to this is bad.

27. *Samskāra* (literally purification, technically, purificatory ceremonies) is that which improves the condition of the body, the mind and the soul. There are sixteen *samskāras* beginning with *niseka* (impregnation) and ending in the ceremation of the dead body. It is everybody's duty to perform these *samskāras*. But nothing should be done for the dead after cremation.†

28. '*Yajña*' is a term covering all the actions done for showing reverence to the men of learning, all scientific inventions and their application, all chemical processes, all educational activities and charities, all performances of *Agnihotra*, homa etc., for the purification of air, rain, water, herbs, etc., for the increase of human happiness, I regard *Yajñas* as excellent things ‡

29. '*Ārya*' means the excellent man. '*Dasyu*' means a wicked man. I take these words in this sense only.‡‡

---

* It denounces the fatalism of the Hindus. (Tr.)

†This refutes the ceremonials done for the well-being of the dead souls—Manes. (Tr.)

‡ If refutes two extreme views ;—

(1) Homa etc., are uselss ceremonials and should be given up.

(2) Homa etc., are the alpha and omega of religion and salvation depends exclusively on them. S. Dayananda means that the word 'yajua' means all good action. (Tr.)

‡‡ It refutes the prevalent belief that 'aryas' were a particular race or tribe who conquered the aborigines and named them 'dasyus' (slaves). S. D. holds that all good men, of whatever race, tribe, or country, are 'aryas' and all wicked men are dasyus. (Tr.)

30. '*Āryāvarta*' is the name of this country (India) because the Āryas have been living here from the beginning of the universe. It is bounded on the north by the Himālayas, on the south by the Vindhyā, on the west by the river Ataka and on the east by the river Brahamputra. The country lying within these boundaries is called the '*Āryāvartta*', and its permanent inhabitants are known as Āryas.*

31. The *Āchārya* (perceptor) is he who is the teacher of Vedic lore with all its auxiliaries, who helps in living a right way of life and forsaking the wrong way.

32. A "Pupil" (or disciple) is he who is capable of receiving true instruction and knowledge, who is righteous, who has love for acquisition of knowledge, and who behaves to the satisfaction of the preceptor.

33. The word '*guru*' is applicable to mother and father. He is also called '*guru*' who helps in embracing truth and renouncing untruth.

34. '*Purohita*' (Priest) is he who is the well-wisher of the sacrificer† and preacher of truth.

35. '*Upādhyāya*' is he who teaches any branch of the Vedas.

36. *Shiṣṭāchāra* (culturedness) consists of the acceptance of truth and abandonment of untruth after righteously having practised *Brahmacharya* and studied and ascertained what is truth and what is untruth with the help of the eight proofs (perception, etc.)‡ Those who follow this are called *Shiṣṭas* or gentlemen (cultured).

---

* Based on ancient geography (Tr.)

† Yajna or sacrifice according to S. D. does not convey the idea of slaughtering an animal at the altar of a god. Sacrifice means 'homa' and sacrificer is the householder who invites the priest to perform 'homa' at his house. (Tr.)

‡ Shista means the chosen.
Achara means conduct.

37. I accept the (validity of) eight proofs, *e. g.*, perception etc.

38. *Āpta* (adept) is he who speaks the correct thing, is righteous and tries for the well-being of all.

39. Examination is of five kinds. First, compatibility with the attributes, functions and nature of God and the Vedic science ; secondly (conformability with one or all of) the eight proofs, perception etc. ; thirdly, (accordance with) the laws of nature ; fourthly, the behaviour of the adepts ; fifthly the purity of one's own self These are the five ways in which we can examine what is truth and what is untruth in order to accept truth and reject untruth.

40. Philanthropy or benevolence is that whereby ill-conduct and miseries of men may be removed and good-conduct and happiness may be promulgated.

41. The soul is *free* in (doing) its actions but *dependent* on the law of God in the enjoyment of their fruit. Similarly, God is free in doing all righteous acts.

42. '*Svarga*' is the enjoyment of special kind of happiness and the acquisition of the material which is conducive to such happiness.

43. '*Naraka*'* is the special kind of pain or the presence of that material which produces that pain.

Shistachara, therefore means the conduct of the selected few. Ordinarily the words used in the sense of gsntlemanliness or even etiquette. S. D. mentions the basis of etiquette as distinguished from the mere form.

* In common parlance 'svarga' means 'heaven' and 'naraka' means 'hell', i. e., two particular regions which contatn extreme kinds of happiness and sufferings. In religious books, 'heaven' has been depicted as a place where all sorts of enjoyments can be procured and 'hell' a place where horror reigns supreme. S. D. denounces the regional conception of heaven and hell. According to him, svarga and naraka are two conditions of the soul. (Tr.),

44. 'Birth is the coming of the soul into a corporeal body. It is of three kinds, previous birth, present birth and the next birth.

45. 'Birth' is the conjunction of the soul with the body and 'death', their disjunction.

46. 'Marriage' is the lawful and declared voluntary acceptance of the hand (of the woman by the man and of the man by the woman).

47. '*Niyoga*' is the act of procreation, allowed in *special circumstances* with a secondary husband or secondary wife, either, when one of the married couple dies or is rendered incapable of begetting children on account of impotency or incurable disease. A man is allowed to perform Niyoga with a woman of his own *varṇa* and a woman with a man of her own *varṇa* or higher *varṇa*.

48. *Stuti* (appreciation) consists of describing hearing or intuiting the qualities. Its aim is acquisition etc.

49. *Prārthanā* (prayer) means asking God for a thing (which a soul can get from its connection with God) after one has tried one's best. Its aim is freedom from pride etc.

44. 'Birth' is the coming of the soul into a corporeal body. It is of three kinds, previous birth, present birth and the next birth.

50. *Upāsanā* (or communion) means to make one's qualities, functions and temperaments pure by keeping in view the attributes, function and nature of God as a *model*, to realise by means of yoga etc., that God is all pervading. He is with us and we are with Him. Its aim is the progress of (spiritual) knowledge.

51. "*Saguṇa-nirguṇa Stuti*"—(Attributive and non-attributive *appreciation*) means to say that such and such

attributes there are in God and such and such attributes are not in God. Similarly *Saguṇa* and *nirguṇa Prārthanā* (attributive and non-attributive prayer) means to pray to God for the possession of certain qualities, and for the riddance of certain failings. *Saguṇa* and *nirguṇa upāsanā* (attributive and non-attributive communion) means to look upon God as possessed of all good qualities and free from all blemishes and to surrender oneself altogether to God and His will.*

---

* The English reader will find it difficult to understand the sense underlying the 51st belief. The words 'saguna' and 'nirguna' are very common in India and there is a good deal of misconception about them. Literally Saguna means with attributes (Sa—with, guna—attributes) and Nirguna means without attributes or empty of attributes (Nir—not, guna—attributes). But in common parlance Saguna means corporeal and Nirguna incorporeal. Thus Saguna worship means the worship of incarnations of God through idols and Nirguna worship means the contemplation of God as an invisible and incorporeal being. Svami Dayananda controverts this view. He does not believe in the incarnations of God. He gives his own meanings to the words saguna and nirguna, which are more compatible with the etymological meanings of the words. The Sanskrta word 'Guna' never means body. You can conceive of an object as having certain attributes. This is saguna conception. For instance, water is cold or fluid. Here coldness and fluidity are two attributes which reside in water. You can also conceive of an object as devoid of certain attributes. This is nirguna conception. For instance, water is neither hot nor solid. Here heat and solidity are the two attributes which are denied of water. The complete apprehension of an object requires both saguna and nirguna (attributive and not-attributive) conception. For further explanation, see chapter VII of the Satyartha Prakash. (Tr.)

…DIC LIBR…